

CHURCH HISTORY

VOL. II

JUNE, 1933

No. 2

WHY DID DECIUS AND VALERIAN PROSCRIBE
CHRISTIANITY?

George T. Oborn

DOMINE EVERHARDUS BOGARDUS

Quirinus Breen

THE OPPOSITION TO CAESAR-WORSHIP

E. F. Scott

THE EARLY PURITANISM OF LANCELOT ANDREWES

M. M. Knappen

BOOK REVIEWS

Published by

The American Society of Church History

THE AMERICAN SOCIETY OF CHURCH HISTORY

FOUNDED BY PHILIP SCHAFF, 1888; REORGANIZED, 1906; INCORPORATED BY ACT OF THE
LEGISLATURE OF NEW YORK, 1916

OFFICERS FOR 1932

CONRAD HENRY MOEHLMAN.....	<i>President</i>
FREDERICK WILLIAM LOETSCHER.....	<i>Vice President</i>
FREDERICK WILLIAM LOETSCHER.....	<i>Secretary</i>
ROBERT HASTINGS NICHOLS.....	<i>Treasurer</i>
MATTHEW SPINKA.....	<i>Assistant Secretary</i>

OTHER MEMBERS OF THE COUNCIL

SHIRLEY JACKSON CASE	WILLIAM DAVID SCHERMERHORN
WILLIAM WALKER ROCKWELL	ABEL ROSS WENTZ
GEORGE WARREN RICHARDS	WILLIAM WARREN SWEET
WINIFRED ERNEST GARRISON	JOHN THOMAS MCNEILL
EDWARD STRONG WORCESTER	JAMES MOFFATT
WILHELM PAUCK	

EDITORIAL BOARD OF CHURCH HISTORY

MATTHEW SPINKA, *Managing Editor*
ROBERT HASTINGS NICHOLS
CONRAD HENRY MOEHLMAN, *ex officio*

PUBLICATION OFFICE, SCOTTDALE, PENNSYLVANIA

EXECUTIVE AND EDITORIAL OFFICE, CHICAGO, ILLINOIS

CHURCH HISTORY is a quarterly journal published in March, June, September, December by the American Society of Church History. The subscription price is Three Dollars per year. The price of single copies is seventy-five cents. To foreign countries, the postage of twenty-five cents a year must be added. Subscriptions should be sent to Church History, 610-614 Walnut Ave., Scottdale, Pa., or to Professor Robert Hastings Nichols, 10 Nelson Street, Auburn, New York. Remittances should be made to the order of American Society of Church History.

All communications regarding contributions, book reviews, and other matters of editorial nature should be sent to Professor Matthew Spinka, 5757 University Avenue, Chicago, Illinois.

Claims for missing numbers and changes of address should be addressed to Church History, Scottdale, Pennsylvania.

Entered as second-class matter March 17, 1932, at the post office at Scottdale, Pennsylvania, under the Act of March 3, 1879.

CHURCH HISTORY

EDITORIAL BOARD

MATTHEW SPINKA, *Managing Editor*
ROBERT HASTINGS NICHOLS
WILLIAM WARREN SWEET, *ex officio*

VOL. II

JUNE, 1933

No. 2

CONTENTS

WHY DID DECIUS AND VALERIAN PROSCRIBE CHRISTIANITY?	
By George T. Oborn, Southern College, Lakeland, Florida	67
DOMINE EVERHARDUS BOGARDUS	
By Quirinus Breen, Hillsdale College, Hillsdale, Michigan	78
THE OPPOSITION TO CAESAR-WORSHIP	
By E. F. Scott, Union Theological Seminary	91
THE EARLY PURITANISM OF LANCELOT ANDREWES	
By M. M. Knappen, University of Chicago	95
AMONG THE MEMBERS	105
IN MEMORIAM	105
BOOK REVIEWS	107
McGIFFERT, A. C.: <i>A History of Christian Thought</i> , v. II.....	George W. Richards
SWEET, W. W.: <i>Methodism in American History</i>	Halford E. Luccock
LIETZMAN, H. von: <i>Geschichte der alten Kirche</i> , b. I., <i>Die Anfange</i>	E. F. Scott
WORCESTER, E.: <i>Studies in the Birth of the Lord</i>	Harold R. Willoughby
GARRISON, W. E.: <i>The March of Faith</i>	Gaius Glenn Atkins
MACFARLAND, C. S.: <i>Christian Unity in Practice and Prophecy</i>	John T. McNeill
CORY, D. M.: <i>Faustus Socinus</i>	Charles Lyttle
MATHEWS, S.: <i>New Testament Times in Palestine</i>	Donald W. Riddle
The Church History Deputation to the Orient.....	K. S. Latourette
MACKAY, J. A.: <i>The Other Spanish Christ</i>	William W. Sweet

- HORSCH, J.: *The Hutterian Brethren*.....C. Henry Smith
WESTIN, GUNNAR: *Protestantismens Historie I Amerikas
Förenta Stater*.....P. Stiansen
LEVISON, N.: *The Jewish Background of Christianity*.....Donald W. Riddle
WHITE: *History of the Monasteries of Nitria and Scetis*.....Matthew Spinka
WESTIN, GUNNAR: *Negotiations about Church Unity, 1628-1634*.....J. Minton Batten

Church History

VOL. II

JUNE, 1933

No. 2

WHY DID DECIUS AND VALERIAN PROSCRIBE CHRISTIANITY?

GEORGE THOMAS OBORN

Southern College, Lakeland, Florida

Severe economic depression had the Roman world in its grip during the middle of the third century A. D.; a condition from which the Mediterranean countries never fully recovered. There is much evidence to show that the economic structure of the Empire was crumbling.¹ Very soon the outlying territories of the Empire were overrun by barbarians,² trade collapsed, and brigandage and piracy reappeared on a large scale. All of this was accompanied by a rapid rise in the prices of the commodities of life.³ To-day we look for the causes of economic depressions in intricate and far-reaching social forces. In the third century Romans of the old school had a much more simple and direct explanation. When the Empire fell on hard times and disaster stalked the corners there was only one cause: the gods who had given Rome her power and the Empire its prosperity in the years gone by were being neglected, foreign gods and oriental cults had usurped the religious fervor of the people, and the venerable gods of the Eternal City were angered. The remedy was likewise simple: revive and stimulate the worship of the ancient gods of Rome, thus appeasing their anger, and prosperity would return.

In the fall of the year 249 A. D. Caius Messius Decius, a Roman of the old school, became head of the Roman Empire. His

¹ M. Rostovtzeff: *The Social and Economic History of the Roman Empire*, Oxford, 1926, Chap. IX, X.

² E. Gibbon: *The Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*, Chando Classics, London, 1894, Vol. I, pp. 191-208.

³ F. F. Abbott: *The Common People of Ancient Rome*, New York, 1917, pp. 145-178.

was not an enviable task. A strong army was needed on many fronts, but how were the soldiers to be paid? Decius does not seem to have been one who acted hastily. He probably realized that if the imperial treasuries were low it would bring no permanent relief to increase taxation. Much more fundamental measures were called for. The basic reason for the precarious situation was obvious: the traditional gods of Rome were angered. Philip, the predecessor of Decius, had been a syncretistic orientalist in matters of religion; no wonder, then, that the Empire was headed for the rocks. The surest way to restore permanent prosperity, according to such a Roman as Decius,⁴ would be to revive the worship of the Roman religion throughout the Empire, and the favor of the gods would assure the future. The consequence was that Decius, probably early in January of the year 250 A. D., issued an edict to the effect that all Roman temples should be reopened and all citizens of the Empire should show their allegiance to the gods of Rome by worshipping at these shrines. There is indication, also, that there was a general religious revival at this time.⁵ Thus the measure adopted by Decius was a religious action in its conception and execution. However, this step was not motivated by any personal, pious, religious devotion on the part of Decius, but by the threatening economic ruin of the Empire. The primary and fundamental cause of the imperial action taken by Decius was economic. It does not matter in the least whether he was fully conscious of that fact or not. Decius saw that unless forces could be assembled that would enable him to combat effectively the threatening dissolution, within and without, the Empire would collapse.

It is also important to note that this edict was not specifically directed against any special sect or group in the Empire. All citizens were called upon to declare their allegiance; it was a test of patriotism as well as of religious fervor. It happened, however, that the Christians and the Jews were the only significant groups in the Roman world who could not conscientiously obey this command to worship at the Roman shrines. The Jews had long ago established their right to religious independence and the fact that they refused to obey the edict did not get them into any difficulty. Not so with the Christians. They were still in the position of a *collegium illicitum* in the eyes of the Roman government. Their refusal to conform to the edict was an act of treason. Conse-

⁴ See Dio Cassius, *Roman History*, LII. 36 for a brief exposition of this point of view.

⁵ A. D. Nock, *A diis electa*, Harvard Theol. Rev. 23:251-254.

quently, the reform action which Decius undertook meant persecution with reference to the Christians.

It is very significant that the first imperial persecution of the Christians on a general scale was instigated at the time when the Roman Empire was tottering on the brink of complete economic disaster. It would be apparent to any wide-awake citizen that immediate and drastic action was imperative. The Roman government was always anxious to maintain peace and order in the Empire and any movement or organization that threatened disorder in the body politic was ruthlessly suppressed. However, prior to the year 250, the Roman government had not endeavored to destroy Christianity. Only when popular hostility to the Christians caused public disturbances, or raised a hue and cry, did the government take a hand. This was true even in the case of Septimius Severus, who was struck by the existing conditions which he observed on a tour through the east. From the point of view of the imperial government the Christians must have been, on the whole, very desirable citizens. They were quiet, industrious, prosperous and paid their taxes.⁶ No emperor in his right mind would undertake their extermination or feel called upon to destroy their organization, which fostered such desirable citizens, without great provocation. This provocation did not arise until the economic crisis of the times of Decius and Valerian, at the same time when Christianity had become a veritable state within a state and would appear to any Roman to be a positive political danger. This circumstance goes a long way toward explaining the outbreak, at the middle of the third century, of the first general persecutions of the Christians.

It is very difficult to say how much the prospect of immediate financial returns to be derived from the confiscation of the property of those who would refuse to conform operated in the motivation of Decius in undertaking his reform action. There are, however, some considerations that will clarify the problem appreciably.

In the first place, there is much satisfactory evidence to show that all of the property of the Christians who were condemned to death, banished, or fled was appropriated by the imperial authorities for the use of the state.⁷ It does not appear that the number

⁶ Paul, *Romans*, XIII. 7. Justin, *I Apol.* 17. Tertullian, *de Idol.* 15, *Scorp.* 14, *Apol.* 42.

⁷ Cyprian, *de Lapsis*, 2, 3, 10-12, 35, *Ep.* XIII, 2 (19), XVIII (24), XIX (25), LIII, 4 (57), LXVIII, 4 (66), *ad Demet.* 12, *de Bono Patientiae*, 12. Eusebius, *H. E.* VII. xi. 18. Arnobius, *adv. Nat.* I. 26.

of those who were condemned to death was large, but the indications are that the exiles were quite numerous.⁸ Considering the general prosperity of the Christians it is quite probable that the financial returns from such acquisitions may have been large. It had been the policy of the Roman government to appropriate all of the property of persons subjected to capital punishment,⁹ but in common practice portions more or less definite and fixed had been allotted to the descendants.¹⁰ In the matter of banishment the attitude of the government had been much more lenient. Thus, unless the charge included something of a treasonable nature which might entail total confiscation,¹¹ the commonly established practice in case of banishment was to confiscate either none at all or only a certain portion, the remainder being left in the hands of the individual himself, or going to his family.¹² In contrast to this, judging from the material that is available and cited above, Decius not only appropriated all of the property of those who were sentenced to capital punishment but also invariably seized all of the property he could discover of those who had fled from persecution or had been banished. We are not, however, justified in concluding from this that Decius made the laws of confiscation much more severe than they had been up to his time, or even that he so applied them. It is to be remembered that the refusal of the Christians to sacrifice to the gods of the Roman state constituted a treasonable act in the eyes of the government and thus laid the recusants liable to the extreme of the law. Furthermore, confiscations on mere pretexts had been increasing apace during the third century, with the definite purpose of replenishing the depleted imperial treasury,¹³ and had been carried on in wholesale fashion by Maximinus.¹⁴ Consequently, Decius hardly would be conscious of any special or extraordinary measure in seizing the entire possessions of any recusant member of the Empire. We do not believe that it can be established that the opportunity for pecuniary acquisitions constituted any appreciable motive in his instigation of persecution, but

⁸ Cyprian, *Ep.* XX. 4 (21), LI. 13 (55), LV. 4 (58).

⁹ *Digest of Justinian*, XXVIII. i. 8:4. Eusebius, *H. E.* VI. ii. 13. Humbert, *Confiscatio*, Daremburg et Saglio, *Dictionnaire des Antiquités*.

¹⁰ *Digest*, XLVIII. xx.

¹¹ Tacitus, *Annals*, III. 1. 6, lxviii. 3, XII. xxii. 2, 3. Humbert, *Exsilium*, *op. cit.*

¹² *Digest*, XLVIII, xix. 38:8, xx. 1, xxii. 1, 4. Tacitus, *Annals*, IV. xxi. 5, xx. 2, 3, III. xxiii. 3, xvii. 8, XV. lxxi. 7. Plinius, *Epist.* IV. 11. Humbert, *Exsilium*, *op. cit.*

¹³ M. Rostovtzeff, *op. cit.* pp. 333-341, 367-369, 395-411.

¹⁴ M. Rostovtzeff, *op. cit.* pp. 398-403.

of course it may be confidently assumed that he would be nothing loath to make use of all such opportunities to refill the empty coffers of the state. He must have been fully aware of the general prosperity of the Christians.

There is another phase in the action of Decius that deserves to be considered in this connection. We have already pointed out that martyrdoms were not numerous during this persecution and this fact has significance in two ways. In the first place, it indicates that Decius was not obsessed with the opportunity that would have been offered for financial gain by the wholesale massacre of those who refused to obey his edict. In the second place, it shows an appreciation on the part of the emperor of the economic loss that would have been incurred by unrestrained executions. It is not unreasonable to impute such understanding to Decius since it is known that others realized the situation.¹⁵ Decius had no desire to suppress Christianity by means of bloodshed and thus further to jeopardize the economic welfare of the Empire through the depletion of its population.

What would have been the outcome for Christianity if the policy of Decius had continued to be effectively administered can never be determined. Its enforcement was cut short by the death of Decius, who lost his life in the late summer of the year 251 while he was attempting to stem the tide of northern invasion. He left the Empire not one whit improved and the disastrous plague which soon after swept throughout the Mediterranean world was but another sign and cause of internal decay.¹⁶ This plague was the occasion for an edict by the new emperor, Gallus, calling upon all the citizens of the Empire to offer sacrifice to the gods in order that the latter might be appeased and the plague checked. This once more brought the Christians under the condemning arm of the imperial government as religious and political objectors. It is worth pointing out that plagues have vital economic significance and in so far as they have such they are to be reckoned as economic forces in the causes of persecution. However, the persecution under Gallus was but momentary and not to be classed as an important action on the part of the Roman government.

The accession of Publius Licinius Valerianus to the headship of the Roman world introduces another significant period in the relation of the Roman government to Christianity. Valerian was a

¹⁵ Tertullian, *Apol.* 44.

¹⁶ Eusebius, *H. E.* VII. 1. Pontius, *Vita Cae. Cyp.* 9. Cyprian, *Ep.* LIII. (57), LIV. 6. (59), LV. 7 (60). LVI. (60), *ad Demet.* 5, 7.

man of the same stamp and attitudes as Decius and the arguments offered concerning the motivation of Decius apply also in the case of Valerian. We refer the reader to that discussion as we feel that the point of view there emphasized is vital to a true understanding of the motivation of these two major persecutions. However, the action of Valerian is a little more difficult to understand because he took no action against the religious recusants of the Empire for some years. We have only conjecture to guide us in this difficulty, but again the economic interpretation comes to our assistance. While Valerian was too busy with external matters concerning the Empire to pay much attention to the internal affairs during the early years of his reign, yet he could have continued the persecuting policy of Decius if he had seen fit. It will be permissible to suggest that Valerian observed that, instead of the condition of the Empire improving after the policy of Decius and Gallus had been put into execution, the situation had continued to grow worse. Possibly he may have decided that the policy was in error and so determined to abandon it. With what result? The economic status of the Empire continued on the downward grade! What was to be done? We must not forget that Valerian, like Decius, would be firmly convinced that the welfare of the Empire was dependent upon the favor of the gods. Perhaps, Valerian may have reasoned, the lack of improvement in the Empire was due not to the policy of Decius but to its ineffectiveness! Possibly a more stringent enforcement would produce results. The outcome was that he issued an edict which differed from that of Decius chiefly in this respect: that it was aimed directly at the Christian organization itself.

How far Valerian may have been influenced by his minister of finance, Macrianus, furnishes an interesting speculation but gets us nowhere. Dionysius attributes almost the entire motivation of the persecution to the influence of Macrianus,¹⁷ but while we can readily understand how Valerian's financial secretary would exert much influence on his state policies, the economic situation must have been much more influential than the failures of Macrianus in the practice of his magical arts.

The confiscations that occurred constitute a further problem in the persecutions of Valerian. In this connection it is important to bear in mind that two edicts were issued by Valerian about a year apart which contain important variations. The first, which

¹⁷ Eusebius, *H. E.* VII. 10.

was issued in the year 257, aimed at crippling the Christian organization by sending the bishops into exile and forbidding all Christian assemblies. No general confiscations or executions were called for. Certainly Valerian, as well as Decius, had no desire to destroy, unnecessarily, large numbers of the population and thus further to endanger the already tottering resources of the Empire; it can hardly be imagined that any Roman emperor would hesitate to shed blood through any feeling of human compassion. But the first edict of Valerian failed signally to bring the desired result. The bishops could direct their flocks almost as well from exile as from their home headquarters, and the Christians continued to assemble for their meetings of worship in spite of the danger resulting from the interdict. The logical consequence was a second edict more drastic than the first. It specified the recall and execution of the bishops along with other members of the clergy; senators and other laymen of high rank were to be degraded, their property seized, and themselves executed later if they persisted as recusants; matrons were to be deprived and banished; the Christian servants in the household and employ of the emperor were to be deprived of their property and sent in chains to work on the imperial estates. The former edict against the assembling of Christians was still in effect and its enforcement was continued. The corporate property and funds of the church were appropriated.

That there is a strong economic element here can easily be perceived but how far it was an active factor in motivating the persecution is quite another matter. M. Allard makes much of the desire of Valerian to seize the wealth of the individual Christians and the corporate property and funds of the church.¹⁸ But if this was an important factor it did not become effective until the second edict. The first edict was not only bloodless but without important confiscations. We feel that this inconsistency in the action of Valerian cannot be allowed. His primary motive, fired, it is important to remember, by the economic crisis of the Empire, was to crush the power of the Christians by destroying their organization. Having failed in his first attempt, he had either to abandon his efforts altogether or to take more stringent measures. He adopted the latter course and sought to disable the recalcitrant body by destroying its material resources and by depriving it of both its clerical and lay leadership. This move showed real acumen but he did

¹⁸ P. Allard: *Les dernières persécutions du troisième siècle*, Paris, 1907, pp. 36-57.
Le christianisme et l'empire romain, Paris, 1907, pp. 107-110.

not appreciate the inherent power of Christianity. An important part of his policy was to cripple the organization economically, and it can be readily granted that he would not bemoan the increase that might come thereby to the imperial treasury. Many of the Christians were wealthy, as Valerian must have known, and he aimed at the wealthiest.

The Christian community also had considerable property by this time although most of it must not have been readily convertible. In his earlier work¹⁹ M. Allard asserts that an enormous mass of wealth was thus acquired by Valerian for the imperial coffers, but he fails to give us anything but possibilities in substantiation of this claim. In his last work on the persecutions²⁰ he admits that we know "practically nothing" about the extent of these seizures. Hence, any ascription of a definite motive of confiscation to Valerian on this basis is very precarious. In addition, two further items may be adduced in this connection. According to Roman law²¹ the members of a *collegium illicitum* that had been dissolved were to have the privilege of dividing the property, if any, among themselves. This was not allowed by Valerian in connection with Christianity. But this matter can be easily overemphasized. Even if Valerian did intentionally violate common practice he would not be conscience-stricken in the least. He was seeking to destroy Christianity and it would have been quite foolish to have distributed among the members any funds he may have discovered. It is not necessary to assume that he was motivated by any special avarice in order to comprehend the action which he took. The other item is the story of the martyrdom of St. Lawrence.²² This story seems to have considerable foundation and is not inherently improbable, but dependence cannot be placed upon details, and to assert the avariciousness of Valerian on the basis of it is unwarranted. We find ourselves, therefore, in practically the same position with regard to Valerian as we are with regard to Decius: no direct economic motive can be imputed to either of these emperors.

Nevertheless, we wish to reiterate emphatically the interpretation which we have already expounded: that economic factors were fundamental in the instigation of all of these imperial persecutions. While we do not agree with those writers who point to the confiscations of these emperors as indicating their avariciousness,

¹⁹ P. Allard: *Les dernières persécutions du troisième siècle*, Paris, 1907, pp. 93-113.

²⁰ P. Allard: *Ten Lectures on the Martyrs*, London, 1907, p. 99.

²¹ *Digest*, XLVII. xxii. 3.

²² Ambrose, *de Officiis*, I. 42, II. 28. Prudentius, *Peri Stephanon*, III.

we insist that their action can be explained only on the basis of economic considerations. The economic cataclysm which threatened the Roman Empire during the middle of the third century is well known to all students of Roman history. This, and this alone, constitutes the major explanation for the edicts of Decius and Valerian. They both sought, with much anxiety, to avert the impending economic ruin. Apart from this element the first universal persecutions of Christianity remain genuine enigmas. The fact that these emperors adopted religious methods for accomplishing their purpose is satisfactorily explained, as already pointed out, by the superstitious warp and woof of ancient society. The provocation of the first general imperial persecutions of Christianity was economic.

The capture of Valerian by the Persians was followed by the reign of his son Gallienus. The edict of Gallienus relative to the Christians was one of toleration and forms a fitting climax to the evidence we are presenting in favor of an economic interpretation of the imperial actions against Christianity. The content of the edict is preserved for us by Eusebius:²³ the Christians were to be once more allowed to assemble, their corporate property was to be restored, and they were to be protected from molestation. One question only is pertinent for our purpose: Why did Gallienus reverse the edict of his father? No satisfactory answer can be given, especially on the basis of the customary practice of mercilessly maligning the character and intelligence of Gallienus. But, if we accept, even to a limited extent, the defense of the statesmanship of Gallienus urged by M. Homo²⁴ it will help us to understand the action which he took. Valerian, his father, had tried a soft answer but the wrath had not been turned away from the Empire. Then he had tried two measures of repression, the second more drastic than the first, and both had failed. The Christians were still powerful and the Empire was worse off than ever; Valerian himself was enduring an ignominious captivity. Might not Gallienus have observed that, if toleration was useless, repression was worse than useless, for it simply piled up disasters and internal ruptures when the Empire was already at the breaking point? If Gallienus had given the matter no thought why did he take any

²³ Eusebius, *H. E.* VII, 13. How far this rescript of Gallienus was a genuine edict of toleration and what the consequent status of Christianity was is a moot question but that problem is of minor importance in this connection. The vital point is merely that Gallienus took some favorable action with regard to Christianity. More than that is non-essential to the validity of our interpretation.

²⁴ L. Homo, *L'Empereur Gallien*, *Revue Historique*. 113:1-22, 225-267.

action at all? The evidence that he was influenced by his wife is quite unsatisfactory.²⁵ If his attitude had been one of complete indifference he would simply have done nothing and so allowed the former edicts to be carried out or to fall into abeyance wherever they would. Instead, he took definite action in favor of Christianity. Most of this is mere conjecture, of course, but, if guesses are worth anything historically, our guess is that economic factors played their customary rôle.

In suggesting some deductions coming from the imperial actions of the Roman government against Christianity during the middle of the third century it must be borne in mind that no dogmatic assertions are possible. We recognize the fact that there was a fundamental conflict between the Christian society and the Roman state altogether apart from any economic considerations. The two could not continue to exist side by side indefinitely without some mutual understanding. Conflict or coöperation was inevitable. This situation was perceived in a certain measure by Septimius Severus and must have been clearly evident to both Decius and Valerian. Valerian shows his lucid appreciation of the situation by the method he employed to stamp out the obnoxious sect: he struck at an organization and not at masses of the population. But the Roman government never liked to be unpopular in the execution of its laws, and by the middle of the third century action against the Christians was rapidly becoming unpopular. It necessitated great provocation for the Roman government to take repeated and drastic action against the growing and powerfully influential body of Christians; a group who were, on the whole, loyal citizens and good taxpayers. This provocation appeared in the economic crisis of the Empire; something had to be done. On the other hand, if the Empire had continued to prosper as in the days of Augustus or the Antonines, when Christianity was an illicit but "tolerated" religion, would the emperors ever have taken more drastic measures against Christianity than they did during the first two centuries? Although we recognize the fundamental antagonism between Christianity and the Roman state (which might ultimately have caused general persecutions), we may suggest with some confidence that, had the economic crisis of the third century not overtaken the Empire for another two or three generations and Christianity had continued, as it did, to permeate society, it is very doubtful whether even such an emperor as Decius would have at-

²⁵ P. J. Healy, *The Valerian Persecution*, Boston, 1905, p. 271.

tempted, or felt called upon, to suppress so peaceful and powerful a group as the Christians so long as the Empire seemed to be running smoothly. In other words, a *modus vivendi* in all probability would have been established between the church and the state without severe hostilities, even as it already had been established in large measure in the social and intellectual realms and did become an actuality in the political realm in the days of Constantine.

DOMINE EVERHARDUS BOGARDUS

QUIRINUS BREEN

Hillsdale College, Hillsdale, Michigan

It was long believed that Domine Everhardus Bogardus was the first minister of the colony in New Netherland. This opinion was corrected when in 1857 there was discovered a now famous letter by Domine Jonas Michaëlius, the actual first minister, to Domine Smoutius of Amsterdam.¹

The arrival of Domine Bogardus in April of 1633 is an event worth recalling because his career in the Dutch settlement interests us in more than one way. The would-be heirs of the Anneke Jans Estate, now owned by Trinity Church, who get taken in by clever gentlemen now and then, may be glad to learn that Bogardus was the second husband of Anneke Jans. In fact, a popular encyclopedia stresses this feature almost exclusively, saying that "he is noted as the husband of Anneke Jans".² There are other things which are more important, however. For example, he served the Reformed Church under two governors, Wouter Van Twiller and Willem Kieft, with whom he was involved in hot disputes. He was also in conflict with the competent and honest Lubbertus Van Dincklagen. A Dutchman hailing from the little republic across the sea, Bogardus was a leader of the faction which violently protested against a governor's tyranny. His person and work illustrate the fact that the colonial church was a home-mission enterprise, which more often attracted adventurers than scholars or saints. Moreover, the independence of this minister over against the governors reflects the spirit of the home church in the Netherlands, a church which had just vanquished politically the Arminians at the Synod of Dordt.

Everhardus Bogardus³ was born in Woerden, 1607. He studied at the University of Leiden from 1627 to 1630, and was on

¹ *Ecclesiastical Records of the State of New York*, published by the State under the supervision of Hugh Hastings, State Historian, Albany, 1901, I, 48-68.

² *Encyclopedia Americana*, New York and Chicago, 1928, Art. "Bogardus, Everardus."

³ The following works are easily obtained in any large library: Brodhead, J. R., *Documents Relative to the Colonial History of the State of New York, procured in Holland, England, and France*, Albany, 1856, Vol. I; Idem: *History of the State of New York*, New York, 1853, Vol. I; Corwin, E. T.: *Manual of the Re-*

authority of the Consistory of Amsterdam sent as sick-comforter (*ziekentrooster*) to Guiana (called "Guinea" in all available records). Returning in 1632 with good references, he sought to be examined by the Classis of Amsterdam with a view to being admitted to the ministry. He preached a test sermon on Galatians 5:16, and I should like to know what this lusty young man said about the words, "Walk in the Spirit, and ye shall not fulfill the lust of the flesh." The Classis approved and admitted him.⁴ On July 15 of the same year he was commissioned to take charge of the church on Manhattan Island. We do not know why he delayed going till late autumn, but available evidence points to his arrival on "de Soutbergh" in April of 1633, in company with the new Director General Wouter Van Twiller and Adam Roelandsen, the first schoolmaster.⁵

The church was situated on the East River, on a lot now known as 100 Broad Street. A stable and dwelling adjoined it.⁶ This edifice was to be the scene of many a battle waged by the Domine against Governor Van Twiller. Bogardus was but a youth of twenty-six when he arrived, but he soon proved to be a veteran in the use of invective. From his pulpit he fired shots like: The Governor is "a child of the devil", "a clown in his hide, whose goats are better than he"; and one day he proclaimed that "next Sunday I shall clamp him down so tight that his breast-bone will crack."⁷

It is easy to misjudge both Van Twiller and Bogardus. Granted that both were wilful, stubborn, wrath-harboring, their environment was not designed to evoke tender sentiments. The "majority of the Dutch colonists had gone to the new world to get rich and to return home with full money-bags."⁸ Life was strenu-

⁴ *Eccles. Records*, I, 81f.

⁵ Brodhead: *Hist. of the State of N. Y.*, I, 222f.

⁶ O'Callaghan, *op. cit.*; *Eccles. Records*, I, 85.

⁷ Eekhof: *Nieuw Ned. Biogr. Woordenboek*, "Bogardus"; Idem: *De Herv. Kerk in N. A.*, I, 54; O'Callaghan, *op. cit.*, I, 167.

⁸ Eekhof, *op. cit.*, I, 52.

ous and keyed high. To govern such folk was not easy. Governor Peter Minuit had been forced out by unfair means, and his enemies had prepared a "scandalous pot of fire" to "roast" Van Twiller the moment he set foot in the colony.⁹ An ambitious young minister, desiring to win the favor of the more substantial men, might without much scruple join the faction opposed to the Governor.¹⁰ The latter appears to have behaved in a manner which did not help his cause. Frequently in his cups, loud-mouthed, tactless,¹¹ he invited opposition, inspired no respect. Often laughed at openly by the citizens, consorting with sots, obstructing the work of faithful men like Van Dincklagen, he made his presence so obnoxious that after three years he was dismissed, "full of curses and council dinners".¹² Even then he had the brazenness to remain in the colony, bent upon increasing his wealth.

The minister's intemperate language against the Director General might have had some excuse, but there appears to be less reason why he should have attacked Lubbertus Van Dincklagen who came in 1634 as schout-fiscal. He was a "learned man, a doctor of laws, recommended by Kilian Van Rensselaer as trustworthy", "an honest and competent man".¹³ Being a sort of comptroller of the treasury, Van Dincklagen would censure the loose management of financial affairs. This would bring upon his head not only the wrath of the Governor but of the business men too, the faction usually hostile to Van Twiller. This may account in part for the opposition of Bogardus who, in turn, by his life offended the schout-fiscal. In 1636 we find the latter memorializing the Classis of Amsterdam respecting the pastor's "bad government of the church as well as his conduct and walk."¹⁴ At the same time he memorialized the States General as to Van Twiller's incompe-

⁹ *Ibid.*, I, 52.

¹⁰ Brodhead: *Documents*, I, 206, where the Domine is in conference with leaders of the colony, discussing the tyranny of a governor (Kieft).

¹¹ *Extracts from the Voyages of David Pietersz. De Vries*, in Collections of the New York Historical Society, 2nd Series, N. Y., 1841, I, 257f. After a conversation with Van Twiller De Vries "cannot conceive why the West-India Company sent to the colonies such a fool" as Van Twiller. He also relates of his sottish behavior with respect to the English merchantman which sailed up the river without paying duty.

¹² Bellamy, Blanche Wilder: *Governor's Island*, Half Moon Series, Papers on Historic New York, N. Y., 1897, I, 145.

¹³ Van Rees, O.: *Geschiedenis der Nederlandsche Volkplantingen in Noord-America, beschouwd uit het oogpunt der koloniale politiek*. Drie voorlezingen. Tiel, 1855, p. 35; Eekhof, *op. cit.*, I, 55.

¹⁴ *Eccles. Records*, I, 87.

tence. The Governor and the minister combined in punishing him, for the former withheld his salary, while the latter caused him to be excommunicated from the church. Driven from the community he had to live twelve days in the open, with grass as his only food.¹⁵ It was decided by the Classis to refer his protest to a committee, pending the appearance of Bogardus in person before that body.¹⁶ The Council of Thirteen and the Consistory of New Netherland both upheld the Domine. Likewise the Classis of Amsterdam appears not to have taken the accusations of Van Dincklagen seriously. The documents containing the charges have disappeared, so that we cannot judge the issue.¹⁷ Van Dincklagen may have been over-conscious of his superior learning and efficiency and he was perhaps unduly captious, while the growing influence of the temperamental Domine was not to be ignored. Meanwhile the tendency of the Classis of Amsterdam was to uphold its representative until his guilt had been proved to the handle.¹⁸

Domine Bogardus had come to the colony a bachelor and remained so for five years. In 1638 he married the well-to-do widow, Anneke Jans. A very friendly writer describes the couple as follows: Anneke was at the time of her marriage a "small, well-formed woman with delicate features, transparent complexion, and bright, beautiful, dark eyes. She had a well-balanced mind, winning manners, and a kind heart." The Domine was "large, graceful, sinewy, strong, with a fine, broad, open frank face, high cheek bones, a dark, piercing eye, and mouth expressive of the very electricity of good humor, which was partly hidden by a beard cut in the peculiar fashion prescribed for ecclesiastics during the reign of Henry IV." A more matter of fact author pictures him as "a very large man, with a quick temper, and fond of the good things of life and the devoted care of a wife."¹⁹ Anneke Jans was the daughter

¹⁵ *Ibid.*, I, 127f.; Brodhead: *Hist. of the State of N. Y.*, I, 273.

¹⁶ Bogardus appears actually to have desired a trial. In July of 1638 the Council received his request to depart to the fatherland, but they "deem it necessary to retain the minister here, so that the church of God may increase more and more every day." *Eccles. Records*, I, 116.

¹⁷ *Ibid.*, I, 150f., "Classis of Amsterdam to the Consistory of New Amsterdam, April 22, 1642"; Eekhof, *op. cit.*, I, 57-61.

¹⁸ Brodhead, *op. cit.*, Van Dincklagen's repeated charges caused loss of confidence in the W.-I. Co., so that Van Twiller had to be dismissed. *Eccles. Records*, I, 151, in "Cl. of Amst. to Consist. of N. Amst." ". . . Meanwhile we, here, shall not fail to defend the honor of a minister, our honored colleague, Rev. E. Bogardus . . .".

¹⁹ First quotation of Mrs. Lamb in Goodwin, M. W.: *Annetje Jans' Farm*, Half Moon Series, I, 74; Van Rensselaer, Mrs. J. K.: *De Goede Vrouw of Manna-hata*, N. Y., 1898, p. 21, is the author of the second statement quoted.

of Trijn Jonas, official midwife of New Netherland. Her first husband had been Roelof Jansen of Masterland, by whom she had had five children. Socially the match with the Domine was the best she could have made, save one with a governor. If she had property, he brought her prestige. The five children were to receive two hundred Carolus guldens each upon coming of age, while meantime the Domine and their mother could use this money without paying interest. Furthermore, Bogardus became owner of a sizable estate by this marriage. It was a parcel of land of thirty-one morgen, a bit northwest of the fort, which Van Twiller had given to Roelof Jansen in 1636. Since the Domine already possessed ground on Long Island (called "dominees-hoeck") these new acres (called "dominees-bouwerij") made him one of the very well-to-do.²⁰ The title to the latter parcel passed after many vicissitudes to Trinity Church in 1705.²¹

The newly-weds became the targets for considerable malicious gossip. Envy and perhaps wine caused tongues to wag too freely. A certain Anthony Jansen of Salee and his wife were especially guilty. The wife had spread a tale so indecent as to require a public confession in the church and payment of three gulden to the poor fund.²²

In the spring of 1638 a new Director General, Willem Kieft, arrived. If the portrait of Wouter Van Twiller is drawn in dark colors, that of Willem Kieft is still more unpleasant. "If headstrong arbitrariness and vanity over absolute authority were to be put on a level with true talent for governing, then to be sure the West-India Company made an excellent choice when they selected Willem Kieft as Director General . . . Tact and reflection were as alien to him as warm interest in the welfare of the colony. He was no more fit than his predecessor whom he surpassed in egotism and vengefulness. But what else could one expect of a man who had left France as a bankrupt, and whose effigy was nailed to the gallows at La Rochelle; who also was accused of having absconded with the ransom money entrusted to him to free certain Christian slaves in Turkey!"²³ No less a person than Adriaen Van der

²⁰ Eekhof, *op. cit.*, I, 61f., says 62 morgen; this should be 31 morgen (a morgen is 2 acres); cf. Brodhead: *Hist. of the State of N. Y.*, I, 266; Goodwin, M. W.: *Annetje Jans' Farm*, in loc., I, 72.

²¹ Eekhof, *op. cit.*, I, 63f.; Goodwin, M. W.: *Fort Amsterdam in the Days of the Dutch*, in loc., I, 253f.

²² Eekhof, *op. cit.*, I, 63f.

²³ Van Rees, O., *op. cit.*, p. 44f.

Donck signed a document in 1650 in which, among other things, the administration of Kieft is vehemently assailed.²⁴ The colonists who in the fatherland had been taught to glorify republican ideals complained that "Mr. Kieft's power in this country was greater and more extensive as regards his commission than was that of his Highness of Orange in the Netherlands."²⁵ The best that can be said of Kieft is that he was adventurous. The West-India Company was to discover too late that this man with a magnificent front was essentially incompetent, so that their ledgers in 1646 showed an alarming loss.²⁶

The relations between the Domine and the new Governor were at first friendly, and later bitterly hostile. The former can well be illustrated by the episode of the building of the eight thousand guilder church in the fort. Captain De Vries tells the story. In the year 1642, "as I was every day with Commander Kieft, dining generally at his house, when I happened to be at the fort, he told me one day that he had now built a fine tavern of stone for the English, who, passing continually there with their vessels, in going from New England to Virginia, occasioned him much inconvenience, and could now take lodgings there. I told him this was excellent for travellers, but that we wanted very sadly a church for our people. It was a shame when the English passed there, and saw only a mean barn in which we performed our worship. In New England, on the contrary, the first thing that they did when they had built some dwellings, was to erect a fine church. We ought to do the same; it being supposed that the West-India Company was very zealous in protecting the Reformed (Calvinist) church against the Spanish tyranny; that we had good materials for it; fine oak wood; fine building stone; good lime made of oyster shells, being better than our lime in Holland."²⁷ This interested the Governor, and he arranged for a committee (of which De Vries was to be one) and for the raising of the money;—"the Governor was to furnish a few thousand guilders of the Company's money, and we would try to raise the remainder by subscription. The church should be built in the fort, where it would not be exposed to the

²⁴ *Vertoogh van Nieuw Nederland, weghens de Ghelegenheydt, Vruchtbaerheydt, en soberen Staet desselfs.* In 'sGravenhage, 1650. In Collections of the New York Historical Society, Second Series, I, 127.

²⁵ Statement of Arent van Curler at the house of Domine Bogardus concerning an utterance of Monr. de la Montaigne. cf. Brodhead, *Documents*, I, 206.

²⁶ Goodwin, M. W.: *Fort Amsterdam in the Days of the Dutch*, Half Moon Series, I, 251, 257.

²⁷ Extracts from the Voyages of David Pietersz. De Vries, in loc., I, 265.

depredations of the Indians. Soon the building was started of stone, and was covered by English carpenters with oak shingles, which by rains and winds became blue, and look like slate."²⁸ Van der Donck and others protested against locating the church in the fort on the ground that the fort was too small and that the new building would brake the wind needed for the mills. But the Governor insisted upon placing it there and he had his way.²⁹

The idea of a new church must have appealed to Domine Bogardus, and we may imagine him entering into the plan with zest. The problem of raising money was a serious one. The colonists were not of a deeply religious stripe, and Van der Donck says that the motives of the Governor were to "make a great name for himself, if only it did not cost him or the Company anything."³⁰

Together with Bogardus the Director General planned to raise the money by trickery. The oldest daughter of Anneke Jans, Sarah Roelof, was to marry Dr. Hans Kierstede in 1642. There was much jollity at the wedding. "When the fourth or fifth round of drinking was reached, the Director produced a subscription paper for a building fund. He himself headed the list with a generous gift." Each one thereupon with a light head subscribed heavily, the one vying with the other, and though some repented when their senses returned at home, they were made to pay."³¹ Eighteen hundred guldens were thus subscribed, but many flatly refused to make good. The West-India Company therefore made up the deficiency, so that the Company paid the bill and not the congregation as a whole.³²

The church bore an inscription which is equivocal: "An. Dom. MDCXLII—Willem Kieft, Directeur Generael, heeft de gemeente desen tempel doen bouwen", in which grammatically the subject may be either "Willem Kieft" or "de gemeente".³³

Hostilities between Kieft and Bogardus were occasioned chiefly by the troubles with the Indians. Concerning the Indian

²⁸ *Ibid.*, I, 265; *Ecclesiastical Records*, I, 163ff.

²⁹ Eekhof, *op. cit.*, I, 94; also *ibid.*, 93f., 96ff., for details about letting the contracts; also "Contract for the Building of the Church," in *Collections of the New York Historical Society*, Second Series, I, 282f.

³⁰ Eekhof, *op. cit.*, I, 95, note 1.

³¹ Van der Donck, in Eekhof, *op. cit.*, I, 95.

³² Cornelis Van Tienhoven, *Cort bericht ofte antwoordt* (1650), a supporter of Kieft, tries to enervate Van der Donck's charges, but does not contradict the wedding story; cf. Eekhof, *op. cit.*, I, 96; Goodwin, M. W.: *Annetje Jans' Farm*, in loc., I, 77, mistakenly attributes the wedding story to De Vries.

³³ Eekhof, *Nieuw Nederl. Biogr. Woordenboek*, Art., "Bogardus."

relations an eye-witness can inform us, none other than Captain De Vries. "About this time (1642) a man named Claes Rademaker was murdered by an Indian. When the Indian was asked why he had murdered the man, he said that when the fort was built, he with his uncle and another Indian came to barter some beaver skins, when some of the Swannekins (the Dutch) robbed his uncle of his skins and killed him. He was at that time a small boy, and resolved that when he should become grown to take vengeance of the Dutch, and no opportunity was offered until now. Commander Kieft sent out parties of armed men to retaliate for the murder, but they all miscarried. When Willem Kieft saw that all his attempts failed, and that it would occasion some mischief, and the people began to complain and upbraid him that he was locked up in a good fort, out of which he had not slept one night as long as he had been there, that the wars which he wanted to make were only calculated to give in bad accounts to the Company —when he saw that everything was laid at his door, he called a meeting of the community, and proposed to them to elect twelve men who should take with him the reins of government.³⁴ I was elected one of the number. Governor Kieft proposed the question, whether or not the death of Claes Rademaker should be retaliated, and whether we should declare war against the Indians. It was answered that this required time. . . ." ³⁵ Captain De Vries then submitted reasons against declaring war: "That it would not be beneficial . . . ; that he (Kieft) was the cause why my people of the new colony on Staten Island, in the year 1640 (should be 1641), had been murdered;³⁶ that I knew very well that the Directors of the West-India Company were very much opposed to any hostilities against the Indians, (had indeed on a former occasion forbidden to engage in war because) we must live in good har-

³⁴ Goodwin, M. W.: *Fort Amsterdam*, in loc., I, 246, says that "this gathering was noteworthy as the first effort at popular government in the colony and the burghers shrewdly made the most of it by appointing a Committee of the Twelve Men to coöperate with the Director." Though it is substantially correct to say that this was a step toward popular government, it is not true that this *gathering* maneuvered the Director into accepting the Twelve Men. De Vries, who was one of the Twelve Men and who was at the meeting, relates that the *Director* proposed the Committee.

³⁵ *Extracts from the Voyages of De Vries*, in loc., I, 265.

³⁶ De Vries, *op. cit.*, I, 263, tells how Kieft wilfully sought satisfaction from the Raritan tribe for the killing of some hogs, while the evidence clearly pointed out that servants of the Company had done the deed. On September 1, 1641, he writes: "My people were murdered on Staten Island by the Indians of Raritans . . . , and so my colony of Staten Island was smothered in its birth, by the management of Governor Kieft, who wanted to avenge the wrongs of his people on the Indians."

mony with the natives. I related this to the Governor Kieft, but he did not wish to listen to me. Indeed, the Directors of the Company ought to be more careful, and better acquainted with the officers they sent."³⁷

Shortly after an intoxicated Indian killed a Dutch laborer. The Indians begged Governor Kieft to be allowed to compensate the widow with one or two hundred fathom of wampum. But the Director insisted upon their delivering up the murderer, which the Indians could not do because he was the son of a chief (a thing they confided to De Vries, but dared not tell Kieft). The Indians also pleaded with him to forbid the sale of intoxicants to the natives, for "when they are drunk they committed foolish actions, and often fought with knives."³⁸

On February 24, 1643, the Governor was fully determined to "make these savages wipe their chops." He had already ordered two men "to commence the job." De Vries expostulated with him, saying that it was illegal, that it could not be done without his consent because he was head of the Committee of Twelve. He rehearsed all the reasons he had given before. "But it seems my words would take no hold on him. Everything was settled by his assertions about this slaughter, *desiring now to perform a feat worthy of the ancient heroes of Rome!*" (Italics mine). "On the night between the twenty-fifth and the twenty-sixth of February, 1643, they executed these fine deeds." The slaughter was so horrible, so cruelly refined that even the Romans destroying Carthage might have blushed for them. "Children were snatched from the breasts of their mothers, and butchered in the presence of their parents, and their mangled limbs thrown into the fire or water! Other sucklings had been fastened to little boards, and in this position they were cut to pieces. . . ." "After these exploits the soldiers were rewarded for their services, and heartily thanked with a shaking of hands by the Governor and Director Kieft!"³⁹ According to the prediction of De Vries the Indians retaliated, after which Kieft looked like a sorry Scipio indeed. In March of that same year peace was concluded.⁴⁰

Against this background there emerges a more heroic Domine Bogardus. I shall not say too enthusiastically that he has fully redeemed himself. For we must bear in mind that out of the eight

³⁷ *Ibid.*, I, 266.

³⁸ *Ibid.*, I, 266f.

³⁹ *Ibid.*, I, 268f.

⁴⁰ *Ibid.*, I, 269-272.

great farms only two were operating; one of these was his, but it was endangered by the situation.⁴¹ Besides, the majority of the influential men were opposed to the willful Governor, and it was easy to choose sides. Discounting all that, however, Domine Bogardus was after all on the side of sound sense, of humanity, and of republicanism over against Kieft's insane tyranny.⁴² The terrible philippics of Bogardus against Kieft date from the Indian wars. They cannot very well have taken place earlier, certainly not before the wedding of Sarah Roelof. The denunciations were timely. The pulpit would have broken faith with Christianity had it not sounded a clear protest.

That the Domine took an active part in the councils of the protesting faction is clear from a "Statement of Arent Van Curler" at the Domine's house. There were present: Bogardus, Captain De Vries, Willem De Key, Jan Jansen Daem, Jochem Pietersen Kuyter, Cornelis Meleyn, and others whose names are not given. At this gathering Arent Van Vurler stated "that he had heard Mon^r. de la Montaigne complain in the tavern to Martin Krygier, that Mr. Kieft's power in this country was greater and more extensive as regards his commission, than was that of his Highness of Orange in the Netherlands."⁴³ The Governor's enemies were the best men. The boldest became more outspoken; some challenged him to fights, provided he remove his official cloak. These were fined and banished. No appeal to the fatherland was allowed. A free merchant of Manhattan, Van Hardenburg, who had given written notice of his intention to appeal was condemned to pay twenty-five guilders or be imprisoned until the penalty be paid.⁴⁴

Governor Kieft was on dangerous ground here. Sons of the Dutch Republic, the settlers complained that "one man who represented the West-India Company had acted more arbitrarily than a king would be suffered legally to do."

Domine Bogardus sided with the populace, for which the Governor reprimanded him. On one occasion the minister thundered, "What are the great men of the country but vessels of

⁴¹ Goodwin, M. W.: *Annetje Jans' Farm*, in loc., I, 79f.

⁴² Dr. Eekhof neglects to bring out this background for the conflict between the Director and Bogardus, which accounts in part for the very harsh judgment on the Domine (to be referred to later in this paper).

⁴³ Brodhead: *Documents*, I, 205f. This document is not dated. Reference to Kieft's absolute control through the army, without deference to a council or to the Committee of Twelve Men, and in defiance of the general opinion, appears to be a warranted conclusion.

⁴⁴ Brodhead: *Hist. of the State of N. Y.*, I, 416ff.

wrath, and fountains of woe and trouble? They think of nothing but to plunder the property of others, to dismiss, to banish, to transport to Holland!"⁴⁵

Thereupon, the Governor absented himself from church services, as did other chief provincial officers. Officers and soldiers were directed to have noisy amusements about the church during the sermon; drums were beaten; cannon were fired; and communicants were openly insulted.⁴⁶

The star of Domine Bogardus was beginning to set, however. He continued his opposition to the Governor uninterruptedly for three years or more. This means that for about that length of time the chief officials were alienated from the church. The continual tirades were beginning to pall. But the Domine persisted doggedly, even though his Consistory began to see that the Governor was perhaps getting too unfair a deal. Besides, Bogardus had personal failings of which he appeared to be almost unaware. On January 2, 1646, Governor Kieft sent him an official letter containing various charges, e. g., that Bogardus had spoken evil of his own wife and her sister, while flushed with wine; that he had violated "the pulpit of truth with human passion"; that he had administered the Lord's Supper but had not partaken of it himself; that on September 25, 1639, after having celebrated that sacrament he spent the evening with Jacob van Cuyler and in a besotted condition had denounced the Director; that he had conspired with tramps, one of whom had tried to kill the Governor; that he would preach while drunk; yes, in one sermon had used scandalous language, like, "In Africa by reason of the great heat diverse animals generate among themselves many monsters, but here in a temperate climate we do not know whence these monsters of men come."⁴⁷

Bogardus replied to this letter, but his answer was "futile and senseless." The Governor wrote again, threatening proceedings against him as a "rebel ende contumax aan de justitie." Again an evasive reply was sent; some facts were admitted, for others he wanted more proof; besides, he denied that he could be tried on this side of the ocean.

⁴⁵ *Ibid.*, I, 418. The Governor was deeply offended by this utterance. In his complaint sent to Bogardus, Jan. 2, 1646, he accuses him of having conspired with certain "tramps," among others with Marijn Adriaensen who had tried to assassinate him (Kieft); and when he was put in irons and sent to the Netherlands, Bogardus "fulminated strangely, even besmirching the pulpit with passion."

⁴⁶ *Ibid.*, I, 418, 760.

⁴⁷ Eekhof: *Nieuw Nederlandsch Biografisch Woordenboek*, "Bogardus."

Wisely, the Governor put the matter in the hands of impartial friends, Domine Megapolensis of Rensselaerswijck, Domine Doughty, and two or three citizens.

Meanwhile Domine Bogardus desired to escape it all. He requested the Classis of Amsterdam to appoint a successor and appealed to that body to settle the difficulty.⁴⁸

The two enemies appear to have laid down their weapons now. Both have determined to go to the fatherland for justice.

In the fall of 1647 Kieft and Bogardus embarked on *de Princesse* for Europe. On September 27 the ship sailed into the wrong channel on the coast of England and went to the bottom. Eighty-one persons were drowned, among them the Governor and the Domine.⁴⁹

The life and work of Domine Bogardus have more often been condemned than praised. Dr. Eekhof has gone so far as to say that "he was more of a curse than a blessing to New Netherland."⁵⁰ This strikes me as too harsh an estimate of the man. It is true that the church was torn by his violence, that his own example did not inspire others with piety, that he resorted to trickery in raising funds for building the church, that he contributed toward disrupting the civil affairs of the colony. But it should not be forgotten that the church was a home-mission enterprise, with many members who for years had been content to worship in the loft of a mill, and had no other thought than to get rich quick and retire. Then, too, the Classis of Amsterdam could scarcely induce a gentler type of man to undertake the pastorate in such an unpromising field. Besides, Domine Bogardus did succeed in becoming a respected as well as powerful member of the community. The invectives of Van der Donck are for Governor Kieft, and even in the wedding story the blame is cast upon the Director as initiator of the scheme. Captain De Vries, who roundly condemns both Van Twiller and Kieft, does not lay a finger on Bogardus. And finally, Bogardus took a leading part in the republican or popular protests against the absolutism of Kieft, and he opposed the inhuman war against the Indians.⁵¹

As to the three years conflict with the Director it may be said

⁴⁸ *Ibid.*

⁴⁹ *Eccles. Records*, I, 216f.

⁵⁰ Eekhof: *De Hervormde Kerk in Noord-Amerika*, I, 76.

⁵¹ O'Callaghan, *op. cit.*, I, 266; Brodhead: *Hist. of the State of N. Y.*, I, 350.

that the latter laid himself open to constant attack for his incompetence. In 1644, a year after the Indian war, eight burghers sent a letter to the government in Holland, in which they complain that "our fields lie fallow and waste, our dwellings and other buildings are burned. We are burdened with heavy families; have no means to provide necessities any longer for our wives and children."⁵² And when Kieft was recalled the news was hailed with joy.⁵³ In New England the opinion was expressed "that (in the tragic death of Governor Kieft) the solemn providence of God had appeared, to bear witness against those who had so many years injured his own people in those parts, which some could not pass by without due acknowledgment and observation."⁵⁴ The Domine had undoubtedly been too violent, but there had been cause.

If criticism must be made, one might say that Bogardus was not what one would call a "spiritual" man, that Christian ethics was too little the code of his life, that he was more careful about securing his own position economically and socially than building up a sound church, and that too often he preached like a politician when he should have broken the bread of life.

But the same can be said of scores of other Dutch Calvinists and other preachers of the early seventeenth century. We regret that the Domine and the Governor were prevented by death from laying their disputes before the Dutch civil and ecclesiastical courts. The records, now so inconclusive, would have been absorbing.

⁵² Villard, Oswald Garrison: *Early History of Wall Street*, 1653-1789, Half Moon Series, I, 99.

⁵³ Brodhead, *op. cit.*, I, 416.

⁵⁴ *Eccles. Records*, I, 217.

THE OPPOSITION TO CAESAR WORSHIP

E. F. SCOTT

The Union Theological Seminary, New York City

It was on the question of Caesar worship that Christianity and Paganism joined battle. They were radically opposed, but the conflict broke out on this definite issue; and its real nature has commonly been misunderstood.

There is no occasion, in this brief paper, to discuss the origin and history of the imperial cult. Enough to say that its motive was at once political and religious. On the one hand it was nothing but a civic ritual, by means of which the diverse races could express their common loyalty to the empire. It did not seek to displace any existing religion. It was not so much a mode of worship as a patriotic gesture, like the salutation of the flag. Yet it did, in some measure, answer to a religious need. The old religions were all associated with the tribes or cities which practised them, and had lost their purpose when these were absorbed in the composite empire. What was to be the religion of the empire itself, which was now being organised as a single corporate state? To the ancient mind a political system was unthinkable apart from a religious sanction, and since there was no traditional cult on which all the races could unite, a new one had to be devised. It found its object of worship in the state itself, as represented by its supreme ruler.

Why was it that the Christians accepted martyrdom rather than acquiesce in this new cult? Nothing was required of them, as humane judges would sometimes point out, but a formality. If they were loyal subjects, they might surely affirm it by the conventional act of homage. In Japan at the present day the Christian church finds no difficulty in adapting itself to a patriotic cult which differs little from Caesar worship. In this country, as in most others, there are national ceremonies, of a semi-religious nature, to which every one conforms, with a perfectly good conscience. What was it in the Roman ceremonial which aroused the fierce opposition of the church?

It cannot have been simply that Christian reverence was shocked with the blasphemy of exalting a man, often of doubtful character, to the place of God. No one pretended that the emperor was God. All that was claimed for him was that as God's vice-gerent he exercised a divine function, which ought to be ac-

knowledged by suitable homage. Paul himself had declared, in so many words, that such honour to the supreme ruler was part of a Christian's duty. It may be doubted, moreover, whether monotheism, in the strict Jewish sense, had taken any deep root in the Gentile church. Most of the converts had come directly from Paganism, and were imbued with the Pagan feeling that the difference between divine and human was one of degree. In the heretical sects the worship of angels was prevalent, and the first impulse, even of the orthodox seer of Revelation, is to fall down before the angel and worship him. The mood which gave rise at a later time to the cult of Virgin and saints was already manifest. The Pagan gods were indeed objects of aversion; but this was principally due to the belief that they were disguised demons. As the upholder of law and order, the emperor might justly claim to represent God himself, and to have a title to divine honours.

It was not a monotheistic but a specifically Christian feeling which opposed itself to the cult. The emperor was encroaching on the prerogatives of Christ. He arrogated to himself the name "Kurios" which belonged to Christ alone. He demanded the universal homage which would be rendered to Christ in the coming age. That this was the real motive of the opposition is clear from the Apocalypse, where the deified Emperor appears in the character of Antichrist. The book revolves around the theme of a Kingdom of Satan, which is seeking to frustrate that Kingdom of God which Christ will establish. It is Satan who has clothed the emperor with power, and through him exacts the world's worship. To join in that worship is to throw in one's lot with the Kingdom of Satan, and so to repudiate the Kingdom of God.

The full force of the Christian sentiment can only be understood when we consider the strange affinities between Caesar worship and Christianity. At first sight they appear to be almost grotesquely different, and yet at a number of points they touched each other and were in a real sense competitors. (1) For one thing, each of them offered a religion for all men. The Christians looked for a time when the kingdoms of this world would become the Kingdom of Christ, and in Caesar worship this aspiration was forestalled. Caesar had made himself, here in the present, the object of a universal cult. He was acclaimed not merely as the world's ruler but as its "Lord". (2) Again, for Caesar worship as for Christianity, there was an incarnation of the divine in the human. From the Christian point of view the imperial cult was blasphemous, but the blasphemy did not consist in the denial of

monotheism. In Christianity also a man was worshipped as God; but this new cult had supplanted Christ with another man. It was this that constituted its deadly sin. (3) Again, both Caesar worship and Christianity were of recent origin. Other religions might be false, but they were at least bound up with immemorial custom. They had a prescriptive right, and the church was obliged to be patient with them. But Caesar worship, like Christianity itself, was a new-comer. It was a rival cult, the product of the same age and culture, and was thus marked out from the first as the enemy. (4) Once more, the work of Caesar was in some degree similar to that of Christ. Formerly it was assumed that Caesar worship was nothing but servile flattery, pushed to the extreme limit; but no one now would accept that judgment. There was a real sense of gratitude behind the cult. Caesar had brought peace on earth, had saved mankind from terrible evils, was present everywhere through his laws and officers as the protector of the weak, had bound the nations together in a brotherhood. In a later age this analogy between Caesar and Christ was recognised, and gave rise to that doctrine of the twofold empire of which Dante was the chief prophet. The two powers, Christ and the emperor, were held to be complementary. They were both appointed by God, one to rule in the spiritual and the other in the temporal sphere. The early church perceived the likeness between the two powers, but in the difference of spheres it saw antagonism. This world, which was given over to Satan and was doomed to perdition, could in no sense have fellowship with the Kingdom of God. If Caesar imitated the work of Christ, it must be because he was the caricature of Christ. In gross material fashion he made a show of divine power in order to delude men into worshipping him. He was the Antichrist, performing his impious miracles in the realm of evil.

It was by no accident that the chief manifesto against Caesar worship took the form of an Apocalypse, for the opposition had its ground in apocalyptic ideas. A crisis was believed to be imminent, in which the present order and the higher one would clash together. The conflict between God and Satan had already been fought out in the unseen world, and now it was transferred to earth. Satan was marshalling his forces, and for this purpose had devised the imperial cult. Those who submitted to it would enlist themselves under his banner. They would flatly deny the confession "Jesus is Lord". It must never be forgotten that to the early church these ideas were intensely real. There could be no compromise with Caesar worship, which meant nothing else than desertion to the enemy in the crucial moment of a battle.

In this light, too, we must account for the pressure which was placed on the church by the Roman government. It is highly significant that the Jews, although they had lately been engaged in a great rebellion and were planning another, were exempted from Caesar worship. They objected to it from religious motives, and this was fully understood and conceded. As worshippers of one invisible God they could not be required to worship Caesar. There was plainly no political element in their observance of the first law of their religion. But the Christians were on a different footing. They were known to serve another King, one Jesus. They openly professed that they looked for a new order which he was to establish on the ruins of the existing order. These ideas were in essence religious, and were fully compatible, as the church protested, with civic loyalty. But they were conceived realistically and set forth in apocalyptic language. The Roman government can hardly be blamed if it failed to distinguish between the substance of the Christian hopes and the forms in which they were proclaimed. It insisted that the church should conform to the official cult and so give proof of its loyalty. Properly speaking, there was no religious persecution, which was quite alien to Roman sentiment and methods. By a confusion of ideas, on the part of both Romans and Christians, a religious belief was construed politically.

So the conflict with Caesar worship may be said to have arisen out of a misunderstanding. The church, in its apocalyptic mood, mistook the secular power for the power of evil; the government mistook the Christian ideals for a political programme. Yet, on a deeper view the ground of conflict was well chosen. The imperial cult brought to its sharpest expression the inherent difference between Paganism and Christianity. Caesar was the embodiment of all material forces—pride, wealth, domination, the glory of this world. Were these things to be worshipped? Were they to be regarded as the highest good? The church declared that Jesus was Lord. It understood his lordship in crude, apocalyptic fashion, and so involved itself in a dangerous antagonism which might have been avoided. Yet at the heart of its confession there was a sense of those things which Jesus stood for. This was the real issue, and in the course of the struggle it became ever more explicit. By its resistance to Caesar worship the church established, for all time to come, the Christian conception of life.

THE EARLY PURITANISM OF LANCELOT ANDREWES

M. M. KNAPPEN

The University of Chicago

It is a commonplace that young radicals become old conservatives. Not only does this principle apply in modern life but it also finds illustrations in the history of party movements in earlier times. The English Puritans, who were the progressive group of the late sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries in their country, experienced this regular defection of some of their most promising young adherents. The two famous bishops of the English Church in Ireland, James Ussher and William Bedell, were strongly inclined towards Puritanism in their early years. Samuel Ward, the great Master of Sidney Sussex College, Cambridge, and delegate of the English Church to the Synod of Dort, was another who became more moderate with the years. In the tributes which have been written¹ to the memory of Lancelot Andrewes as a great High Churchman, court preacher, stylist and Anglican devotional writer, the fact that he also passed through such a stage in his development has been generally neglected. Nevertheless such was the case, and during his early years, Andrewes made an important contribution to the development of one of the most characteristic Puritan doctrines, that of the Sabbath.

The sources of Andrewes' Puritanism are difficult to trace. Little is known of the theological attitude of his parents and schoolmasters, and of course during his boyhood in the first decade of Elizabeth's reign the dividing line between Puritan and Anglican was not yet clearly drawn. But what little we do know is certainly not opposed to the hypothesis that his early environment inclined him toward Puritanism. His seventeenth century biographer tells us² that Andrewes' parents were "honest and religious", that his

¹ e. g., Canon J. H. Overton in *The Dictionary of National Biography*; R. L. Ottley: *Lancelot Andrewes*, London, 1894; Dean R. W. Church, art., "Lancelot Andrewes" in Alfred Barry ed.; *Masters in English Theology*, London, 1877; W. H. Teale: *Lives of English Divines*, London, 1846; A. T. Russell, *Memoirs of the Life and Works of Bishop Andrewes*, London, 1863, (This work is the most complete from a factual point of view); T. S. Eliot: *For Lancelot Andrewes, Essays on Style and Order*, London, 1928.

² Isaacson, "Life of Andrewes" in Andrewes' *Two Answers to Cardinal Perron*, ed. J. Bliss (in the Library of Anglo-Catholic Theology, Oxford, 1854), pp. iii, iv.

father, Thomas Andrewes of All-Hallows parish, Barking, was a sea-faring man who rose to be one of the Masters of Trinity House, and that he was able to leave his son a considerable estate in Essex. Lancelot was first sent to the Coopers' Free School in Stepney parish, and later to the newly-founded Merchant Taylors' School, where his master was Richard Mulcaster, celebrated as a disciplinarian. Of the schoolmaster's theological views, however, little is known, and we are similarly ignorant of the doctrinal position of the Mr Ward who first taught Andrewes at the Coopers' School. Nevertheless from what we know about the attitude of London merchants with overseas interests during even the early part of Elizabeth's reign we are safe in concluding that Andrewes' early training was not such as to prejudice him against that extreme Protestantism which came to be known as Puritanism. The trading class of the time was generally hostile to France and Spain, and consequently almost unanimously anti-Catholic in its religious attitude.

Whatever were the sources, the fact of Andrewes' early Puritanism becomes clear when we notice his early patrons and the friends with whom he chose to associate while at Cambridge. The earliest guardian of Andrewes' fortunes was Sir Francis Walsingham, who with Leicester and Sir Francis Knollys, led the Puritan party at court. He it was who arranged for young Andrewes to receive a scholarship at Pembroke Hall, and when his talents were developed there it was Walsingham who took care that they should not be buried in the country. He secured for Andrewes appointments in London,³ and when his protege began to move towards the right, as we should say, Sir John Harington specifically tells us that his counsellor patron labored with him to support the Puritan cause. Andrewes was also on friendly terms with another leading Puritan of the time, the Earl of Huntingdon, President of the Council of the North. Near the close of his career at Cambridge in 1586 Andrewes accompanied Huntingdon as his guest on a trip to the Northern Counties, and repaid him by laboring, successfully we are told, to convert Roman Catholics in that area.⁴

Andrewes' early associates at Cambridge indicate his Puritan-

³ Isaacson, *ut supra*, vii. Sir John Harrington: *Briefe View of the State of the Church of England*, London, 1653, p. 143. This passage is reprinted in Andrewes' *Two Answers to Cardinal Perron*, *ut supra*, p. xxxvi. R. L. Ottley (*op. cit.*, pp. 6, 7) states, without reference, that Walsingham was a neighbor of the Andrewes family, but from the data given in Conyers Read: *Mr. Secretary Walsingham and the Policy of Queen Elizabeth*, 3 vols., Oxford, 1925, this appears improbable.

⁴ Isaacson, *op. cit.*, p. vii.

ism even more clearly. He was a member of Pembroke Hall, a foundation distinguished as a Protestant and Puritan center. Three prominent Marian martyrs, Ridley, John Rogers, and John Bradford came from its ranks, and Richard Greenham, a leading Puritan of the time was still in close touch with that institution though he had just vacated his fellowship to accept a living in the near-by village of Dry Drayton.⁵ Thomas Fuller whose father knew Greenham tells us⁶ that while at Pembroke "the youth of Mr Lancelot Andrews (afterwards bishop of Winchester) was well acquainted with Mr Greenham; and I dare boldly say, if Greenham gained any learning by Andrews, Andrews lost no religion by Greenham."

During this same period we find Andrews indulging in the university equivalent of those Puritan "prophesyings" which Elizabeth opposed so vehemently and which she finally suppressed. Concerning John Carter, later a distinguished Suffolk Puritan, we are told that while at the university

he held constant Meetings with divers of his famous Contemporaries, and that every week, as with Dr. Chaderton, Dr. Andrews (after Bishop Ely), Master Culverwell, Master Kewstubs [sic] and divers others . . . At their Exercises: first, they began with prayer, and then applied themselves to the Study of the Scriptures; one was for the Original Languages, another's task was for the Grammatical Interpretation; another's for the Logical Analysis; another's for the true sense and meaning of the Text; another gathered the Doctrines, and thus they carried on their several employments till at last they went out, like Apollos, Eloquent men, and mighty in the scriptures.⁷

It is noteworthy that the three companions of Andrewes mentioned in this passage were distinctly Puritan throughout their entire careers. Laurence Chaderton became the Master of the great Puritan foundation, Emmanuel College, while Knewstubs came to be considered the leading Puritan in the eastern counties, and both represented their party at the Hampton Court Conference.⁸ Ezekiel Culverwell, Chaderton's brother-in-law, was later a prominent Puritan pastor and writer in Essex.

These men were not the boldest controversialists on such

⁵ See D. N. D. art. "Greenham." Samuel Clarke: *Lives of Thirty-Two English Divines*, third ed., London, 1677, p. 13.

⁶ *The Church History of Great Britain*, IX, VII, 65 (1845 ed., V, 191).

⁷ Samuel Clarke: *Lives of Thirty-two English Divines*, p. 133. This information came from his son. cf. D. N. B. art. "John Carter."

⁸ Cf. D. N. B. on Chaderton and Knewstubs and art. "Nathaniel Culverwell."

topics as church government and ceremonies, and there is nothing in the evidence as presented to justify the conclusion that Andrewes was ever an extreme Puritan on these particular points. But I believe it is fair to conclude that until the late fifteen-eighties his attitude was that of a moderate Puritan. Not until he was well past his thirtieth year, when he accepted the favor of Whitgift and the Queen and entered upon that career as a court preacher which was to bring him so much fame and fortune, can he be said to have separated from the Puritan party. Before that time though party lines were not sharply drawn, all the available evidence tends to connect Andrewes with the Puritan wing of the English Church.

This conclusion receives a somewhat striking confirmation when one begins to look into the early history of the Puritan Sabbatharian movement. The name which has been most commonly connected with the development of this doctrine is that of Nicholas Bound or Bownde, a Suffolk clergyman, though Fuller and some others have mentioned Greenham as the author of a prior treatise.⁹ Bownde's book entitled *The Doctrine of the Sabbath* appeared in 1595, and was suppressed by authority of the Archbishop and Lord Chief Justice Popham. The sequel is best given in Fuller's own inimitable style:

But though both minister and magistrate jointly endeavoured to suppress Bound's book, with the doctrine therein contained, yet all their care did but for the present make the Sunday set in a cloud to arise soon after in more brightness . . . And though he (Popham) had a dead hand against offenders, yet these sabbatarian doctrines, though condemned by him, took the privilege to pardon themselves, and were published more generally than before. The price of the doctor's book began to be doubled; as, commonly, books are then most called on when called in, and many who hear not of them when printed inquire after them when prohibited; and though the book's wings were clipped from flying abroad in print, it ran the faster from friend to friend in transcribed copies and the Lord's day in most places was most strictly observed . . . Yea, six years after, Bound's book came forth, with enlargements, publicly sold; and scarce any comment, catechism, or controversy was set forth by the stricter divines, wherein this doctrine (the diamond in this ring) was not largely pressed and proved; so that, as one saith, the sabbath itself had no rest.¹⁰

⁹ *Church History*, IX, VII, p. 69. (1845 ed., V, p. 193). Benjamin Brook: *Lives of the Puritans*, London, 1813, Vol. I, p. 415. J. B. Marsden: *History of the Early Puritans*, London, 1853, p. 246. Fuller makes 1592 the date of Greenham's death, but he lived until after the Lopez affair in 1594 (*Works*, Preface xi). See D. N. B. article, "Greenham," and *Notes and Queries*, VI, 8, 55. His works were edited after his death by his friend Henry Holland, and first published in 1599, four years after the first appearance of Bownde's book.

¹⁰ *Church History*, IX, VII, p. 69. (1845 ed., V, p. 193).

Fuller's summary of the contents of this influential volume is as follows:—

- (1) That the commandment of sanctifying every seventh day, as in the Mosaical Decalogue, is moral and perpetual (not ceremonial and binding only during the Jewish dispensation).
- (2) That whereas all other things in the Jewish church were taken away, (priesthood, sacrifices, and sacraments,) this sabbath was so changed that it still remaineth.
- (3) That there is a great reason why we Christians should take ourselves as straitly bound to rest upon the Lord's day, as the Jews were upon their sabbath, it being one of the moral commandments, where all are of equal authority.
- (4) The rest upon this day must be a notable and singular rest, a most careful, exact, and precise rest, after another manner than men are accustomed.
- (5) Scholars on that day not to study the liberal arts, nor lawyers to consult the case, nor peruse men's evidences.
- (6) Serjeants, apparitors, and summoners to be restrained from executing their offices.
- (7) Justices not to examine causes for the conservation of the peace.
- (8) The ringing of more bells than one, that day, is not to be justified.¹¹
- (9) No solemn feasts, nor wedding dinners to be made on that day —with permission notwithstanding of the same to lords, knights and gentlemen of quality; which some conceive not so fair dealing with him.
- (10) All honest recreations and pleasures, lawful on other days, (as shooting, fencing, bowling,) on this day to be forborne.
- (11) No man to speak or talk of pleasures, or any other worldly matter.¹²

However this doctrine, in all its essentials, was worked out and publicly taught by Lancelot Andrewes ten years before while a Puritan fellow of Pembroke Hall. An eighteenth century student, presumably a New Englander, once noted this fact. In the Prince Collection in the Boston (Massachusetts) Public Library there is a copy of the second edition of Bownde's work. On the

¹¹ This regulation which is frequently quoted by later writers as the most fantastic and ridiculous of the Puritan rules for the Sabbath was rather anti-catholic than Sabbatarian in its origin. It is to be found in the Injunctions and Articles of Archbishop Grindal, where it was obviously placed with a view to the suppression of Roman Catholic practises. cf. Grindal's *Remains*, (Parker Society, Cambridge, 1843) pp. 137, 160.

¹² *Church History*, IX, VIII, 20 (1845 ed. V, 212, 213).

fly-leaf is written the name *Henry Owen*, and a little after, apparently in the same hand, there follows this note:

January 5, 1713-4

The author of this Booke is Recommended as being one of the first in handling the argument he treats of. Yesterday I saw a Treatise of Dr. Lancelot Andrews, Bishop of Winchester on the Commandments. This learned man treats excellently on the Fourth. The Booke was printed Anno 1650, but the preface acquaints us that they were lectures read by him at Cambridge when he was Fellow of Pembroke Hall 1585. He was then about thirty years old.

This is correct. In 1578 Andrewes was appointed catechist of his college, and his seventeenth century biographer thus describes the result:

Purposing to read upon the Ten Commandments every Saturday and Sunday at three o'clock after noon, which was the hour of catechising, not only out of other colleges in the University, but divers also out of the country, did duly resort unto the college chapel, as to a public divinity lecture.¹³

Another contemporary speaks in a similar vein about the popularity of the content of these lectures:

In those days when it was Preached he was scarce reputed a pretender to learning and piety then in Cambridge, who made not himself a disciple of Mr. Andrewes by diligent resorting to his Lectures; nor he a pretender to the study of Divinity, who did not transcribe his notes, and ever since they have in many hundreds of copies passed from hand to hand, and have been esteemed a very Library to young Divines, and an Oracle to consult at, to Laureat and grave Divines.¹⁴

In spite of their popularity these lectures like many of Andrewes' other works were not printed until after his death, and then at first only in a very confused and fragmentary form. The volume, which was published anonymously, bore the title *The Pattern of Catechistical Doctrine*, and is apparently a copy of a set of manuscript notes taken by a listener.¹⁵

¹³ Isaacson, *Life, ut supra*, vi.

¹⁴ John Jackson, "Epistle Dedicatory" to *The Morall Law Expounded*, etc., by Bishop Andrewes, London, 1642, A. 3. verso.

¹⁵ The problem of the true text is naturally a difficult one in view of the manner in which the material for the various editions was collected and prepared for publication, and some corrections should be made in the statement on the subject by James Bliss, who edited the reprint in the Library of Anglo-Catholic Theology under the title of *A Pattern of Catechistical Doctrine*, etc., 1846. The 1630 edition which was published anonymously, can hardly be Andrewes'

In 1642 a much improved edition was put out with a dedication "to the High Court of Parliament" which was justified in part by the editor, John Jackson, on the ground that

Here are two strong and sinewy Tractates, the one about Idolatry in handling the second Commandment; and the other about the observation of the Sabbath, under the fourth; which will both notably redargue the late heterodox insinuations of both doctrine and practise in some, anent those things, and concurre with you in propugning the Orthodox tenets of both these points.¹⁶

Finally in 1650 an Anglican editor published an even fuller version, from what he asserted to be "the Author's own copy . . . the only copy he had, as is acknowledged under his hand in the beginning of the book." Unfortunately he altered the section on the Sabbath to "clarify" Andrewes' position, and to bring it into harmony with the attitude which the bishop expressed later in life. Several paragraphs are therefore inserted to give what the editor considers to be the proper doctrine, and to demonstrate that Andrewes really maintained that position, at least in later life.¹⁷ Had our eighteenth New England historical critic chanced upon any other edition than this particular one, he might have seen even more clearly how "excellently" Andrewes did treat the Fourth Commandment.

As we have stated, practically all of Bownde's teachings can

manual of his lectures, but must be a student's notes thereon. It is so abridged as to be unintelligible in places without comparison with the expanded text of 1642. For example, the argument about Saul being among the prophets (cf. 1642 edition, p. 330) appears simply as: "It were not wise to set a ceremonie in the midst of morall precepts; there be many amongst the Prophets that cannot distinguish." (p. 234). Furthermore the editor of the 1650 edition comments at length upon the "broken rubbish" and "indigested chaos" of the previous editions, and claims to have prepared his edition from the "Author's own copy"—"The only copy he had, as is acknowledged under his hand in the beginning of the book." (Preface, pp. xvi, xvii). The 1650 copy, which was reprinted in 1675, is therefore probably the best for most passages except those which the editor has admittedly altered, such as the one on the Sabbath. On that topic we must be satisfied with the 1642 edition as giving the fullest and most accurate report available of what Andrewes actually said.

I have, however, quoted also from the 1846 edition as being more generally accessible, and containing some material not in the 1642 edition. It was a reprint of an expanded version of the 1630 text, which appeared in 1641, and of which a copy is in the British Museum. There was another 1641 edition, also based on the 1630 text, which Bliss does not mention. It contains fewer additions than the one which he used. A copy of it is in the Bodleian. The 1642 edition was entitled *The Morall Law Expounded*, and the others *The Patterne of Catechisticall Doctrine*. The 1630 and 1641 editions were published anonymously.

¹⁶ A, 4, *recto*.

¹⁷ Anonymous editor, 1650 edition, Preface, B. 4 *verso*.

be found in the section on the Fourth Commandment in these lectures, of which the best edition for our purposes is that of 1642. The same is also true of Greenham's doctrine. The outline and the argument are identical as a comparison of Andrewes' work with those of Bownde and Greenham¹⁸ will, I think, clearly demonstrate to the satisfaction of anyone who cares to consult them. Space does not here permit a detailed summary of the argument, and we must content ourselves with mention of Andrewes' four main points and references to the corresponding passages in the works of the other Puritans where the same reasoning appears.

Andrewes first undertakes to prove that the Fourth Commandment is a part of the moral law, which is still binding on Christians, rather than a ceremonial decree invalidated by the advent of the Christian dispensation. He supports this contention by alleging that the Sabbath existed in the Garden of Eden before the introduction of ceremonies,¹⁹ and also by maintaining that the Ten Commandments as a whole are a moral code, and that each of them must therefore be a bit of moral legislation.²⁰ He then argues that in New Testament times the particular day to be observed as a Sabbath had been changed from Saturday to Sunday, partly to commemorate such events as the Resurrection and Pentecost which occurred on the first day of the week, and partly to emphasize the fact that the Jewish dispensation had ended.²¹ Passing to the subject of how to keep the Sabbath he forbids practically everything prohibited on that day in the Old Testament, such as buying and selling, fairs and markets, burden-bearing, journeying and harvesting.²² He concludes with a description of the positive duties of the day, such as the obligations to worship God by praying, meditating, and attending divine service and to assist our fellow men by works of charity and mercy.²³

Enough has now been said, I believe, to indicate that An-

¹⁸ "A Treatise of the Sabbath Day" in his *Workes* (1612 ed.), pp. 128-171. I quote from the 1612 edition as being the most accessible. The treatise is unaltered in all the editions.

¹⁹ Andrewes, (1642 ed.) p. 329; (1846 ed.) p. 154. Greenham, p. 133. Bownde, (1595 ed.) p. 5; (1606 ed.) p. 6.

²⁰ Andrewes, (1642 ed.) pp. 330-333; (1846 ed.) p. 154. Greenham, p. 136. Bownde, (1606 ed.) pp. 37-39.

²¹ Andrewes, (1642 ed.) pp. 331, 332; (1846 ed.) p. 155. Greenham, pp. 155, 156. Bownde, (1595 ed.) p. 39; (1606 ed.) p. 68.

²² Andrewes, (1642 ed.) p. 339; (1846 ed.) p. 158. Greenham, pp. 162-171. Bownde, (1595 ed.) pp. 62-148; (1606 ed.) pp. 122-285.

²³ Andrewes, (1642 ed.) pp. 342-362; (1846 ed.) pp. 158-169. Greenham, pp. 156-161. Bownde, (1595 ed.) pp. 149-286; (1606 ed.) pp. 285-475.

drewes' doctrine of the Sabbath was substantially the same as that of the more famous work of Bownde and the earlier writer Greenham, and was common knowledge around Cambridge years before the works of either of these authors were written. This does not, of course, prove that the two Puritans copied from Andrewes. They may have worked out their theories independently or derived them from a still earlier common source. That they did work out these arguments independently is, however, rendered improbable, not only by the striking similarity of the three presentations, but by the fact that both Bownde and Greenham were contemporaries of Andrewes at Cambridge. Greenham, as we have seen, was well acquainted with the future bishop, and to the passage in Fuller's history which mentions their friendship, there is the significant note "Some say he had a hand in making some of Mr Greenham's works." Bownde was not only a fellow of Peterhouse during the early period of Andrewes' fellowship, but was Greenham's step-son,²⁴ and if he had left Cambridge before the lectures were delivered could therefore easily have obtained access to the notes. Furthermore neither of these men was of a theological turn of mind. None of their other works show any originality in this field whatever. On the contrary a comparison of the second edition of Bownde's work with the first will show that he had a penchant for a show of erudition without the substance. All manner of works of celebrated theologians are cited in behalf of his argument without adding particularly to its content. And there is one passage which is taken word for word from his step-father's work which was now in print.²⁵ While we cannot prove such verbal identity with Andrewes' work because we do not have an absolutely accurate version of the original, it does not seem reasonable to suppose that either Bownde or Greenham developed this doctrine independently.

However we cannot prove that all these writers did not take their ideas from some common earlier source. To do so would be to attempt to prove a universal negative, and Sabbatarianism was known before the time of Andrewes, as the works of Hessey and G. G. Coulton, among others, show.²⁶ In fact Andrewes himself quotes frequently from decrees of early church councils on the subject. All that can be said is that thus far a diligent search through the existing literature on the subject has failed to reveal any such

²⁴ Cf. D. N. B. (Revised ed.), Art. "Greenham" and "Bownd."

²⁵ Cf. Bownde, (1606 ed.) pp. 15, 16, and Greenham, pp. 131, 132, beginning "And the nature of this word *Remember*, etc."

developed theological justification of the practise as that of Andrewes, so that it seems reasonable to suppose that it was he who formulated the Puritan doctrine. Especially does this seem probable in view of the fact that he was a man of learning and ingenuity quite capable of developing a new argument and not the type inclined to copy *in extenso* from others. However to prove this point is not our main purpose. It is sufficient that we are able to establish the fact that in his early career Andrewes was connected with the Puritan party in the church and was one of the earliest exponents of its highly-developed Sabbatarianism.

It might be supposed that in an age when authority availed so much in argument the Puritans would not fail to cite Andrewes as having once spoken on their side of the controversy, nor did they. In 1637 when the theological strife over this doctrine was intense Bishop Francis White, upholding the Anglican position, found it necessary to explain that Andrewes' ideas on the subject had been expressed carelessly before the issue was clearly distinguished.²⁷ Four years later William Twisse, the Puritan, in his *Morality of the Fourth Commandment* demonstrated to his own satisfaction, at least, that "the doctrines of D. Bownde—are the doctrines of D. Andrewes."²⁸ As we have seen the editors of both the 1642 and the 1650 editions of his work noted his original Puritan position. But the anonymous corrector of the latter work was not mistaken in asserting that what he there inserted represented the doctrine, or at least the practise of Andrewes' later years. The Bishop of Winchester made no protest against the issue of the book of sports in 1617, and in the following year he took part in the condemnation of John Trask in the Star Chamber for interpreting the Bible too literally in his exposition of the doctrine of the Sabbath.²⁹ The young radical had indeed become the old conservative.

²⁶ J. A. Hessey: *Sunday, Its Origin, History and Present Obligations, etc.*, London, 1860; G. G. Coulton: *Five Centuries of Religion*, Cambridge, 1927, II, p. 71; *Medieval Village*, Cambridge, 1925, pp. 255, 272, and Appendix 34; Robert Cox, *The Literature of the Sabbath Question*, 2 vols., Edinburgh, 1865.

²⁷ *An Examination and Confutation of a Lawless Pamphlet*, London, 1637 (in the library of Columbia University, New York City; not in the British Museum) pp. 89, 90.

²⁸ pp. 160-164.

²⁹ *Two Answers, etc.*, pp. 83ff.

AMONG THE MEMBERS

The Spring Meeting of the Society was held at Butler University, Indianapolis, Ind., March 27, 28. It was well attended by members and guests, a total of forty-six different persons having been present at the various sessions. Seven papers were read and ample time was provided for their discussion. Ten new members were elected by the Council. Altogether, the cordial hospitality of Butler University made it an enjoyable, and the industry of those reading the papers made it a profitable meeting. Next year the Society is to meet at Oberlin.

Professor Samuel Gardiner Ayres, Librarian Emeritus of Garrett Biblical Institute, was engaged in the following activities in 1932. He prepared a *Centennial Pageant of the Troy Conference* which was given by the Dramatic Department of the Green Mountain Junior College at Saratoga, April 10th. In March and April in New York City he was in charge of the selecting and buying of over 3,000 books for the Jesus Library to be installed in the new million dollar building of the Y. M. C. A. of Jerusalem. He won the prize offered by S. R. Leland for the best paper on *Missionary Methods: St. Paul's or Ours*, by Roland Allen.

The announcement of the election of Professor Shirley Jackson Case to the deanship of the Divinity School of the University of Chicago, in which office he succeeds Dean Shailer Mathews, will be greeted on the part of the members of our Society with satisfaction and pride. Dr. Case occupies a high place among the American church historians, and this recognition of his professional achievements is of particular significance to them. Heartiest congratulations!

IN MEMORIAM

ARTHUR CUSHMAN McGIFFERT, D.D., PH.D., LL.D.

Arthur Cushman McGiffert, Professor Emeritus of Church History at the Union Theological Seminary in the City of New York, and former President of the Seminary, died at his home in Dobbs Ferry, New York on Saturday, February 25th, 1933.

Dr. McGiffert was a graduate of Western Reserve University in the class of 1882, and later became a member of its Board of Trustees. He was a graduate of the Union Theological Seminary in the class of 1885, studying church history under President Roswell Dwight Hitchcock, and taking courses also with the founder of our Society, Philip Schaff. After graduation he went abroad and studied for a year at the University of Berlin and then in 1886-87 was a student of Harnack at Marburg. Harnack invited him to take a room very near his own house and the two went to walk together nearly every day—a type of intimacy with a great teacher which was absolutely impossible during Harnack's crowded years in Berlin. They went to Paris together to work on Greek manuscripts in the Bibliothèque Nationale—McGiffert preparing his doc-

toral dissertation for Marburg: *Dialogue Between a Christian and a Jew*, 1888.

In 1887-88 McGiffert divided his time between France and Italy, spending about five months in Rome in the study chiefly of Christian archaeology. On his return to America in 1888 he became an instructor and later professor in church history at the Lane Theological Seminary in Cincinnati. While there he prepared his translation of Eusebius' *Church History with Prolegomena and Notes*—a book rushed through under great pressure with the assistance of students, which has remained a standard work for over forty years.

In 1893 he was appointed Professor of Church History in the Union Theological Seminary, succeeding Schaff. His first publication at Union was *A History of Christianity in the Apostolic Age*, 1897, which was launched in the stormy waters of the Briggs controversy and directed the hostility of many toward its author. To save the Presbyterian Church, which he loved dearly, from a great heresy trial, McGiffert entered the Congregational ministry.

Subsequent publications of his include *The Apostles' Creed*, 1902; *Protestant Thought Before Kant*, 1911; *Martin Luther, the Man and His Work*, 1911; *The Rise of Modern Religious Ideas*, 1915; *The God of the Early Christians*, 1924; and *A History of Christian Thought*, of which the second volume coming down to Erasmus appeared one month before his death. Of all these his *Luther* had the greatest popular appeal.

Dr. McGiffert was a very clear-headed administrator. He was President of the Union Theological Seminary from 1917 till he retired on account of his health in 1926. Generation after generation of students were trained by his admirable lectures on the History of Christian Thought. We are indeed fortunate that during his years of retirement and illness, when he could work only two or three hours a day, he was able to complete his great work on this subject even as far as the Reformation. It is commonly understood, I believe, among students of church history, that America has produced no greater contribution in this field than McGiffert's *History of Christian Thought*. He is survived by a widow, two married daughters, and by his son, Arthur Cushman McGiffert, Jr., Professor of Christian Theology in the Chicago Theological Seminary since 1926, the author of a recent biography of *Jonathan Edwards*.

William Walker Rockwell.

BOOK REVIEWS

A HISTORY OF CHRISTIAN THOUGHT

By ARTHUR CUSHMAN MCGIFFERT. Vol. II: The West—From Tertullian to Erasmus. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1933. 420 pages. \$5.00.

Professor Adolf von Harnack in the *History of Dogma*, I, 143, E. tr., says: "The spirit of Rome already is apparent in the Epistle of Clement, that of Alexandria in the Epistle of Barnabas, that of the East in the Epistles of Ignatius." The two volumes of Professor McGiffert are an interpretation of this significant statement. The content of the second volume is divided into two parts: Book iii—Christian Thought in the West from Tertullian to Gregory the Great; and Book iv—Christian Thought in the Western Church of the Middle Ages from John Scotus Eriugena to Erasmus. The creative thinkers in the West were Tertullian and Cyprian of North Africa. The one was the theologian and the other the churchman. The theoretical thinking of Tertullian was applied by Cyprian in defining church organization, the place and the authority of the episcopate, the Christian way of living, the training of the laity, and the penitential discipline.

The outstanding thinker of the ancient period, who has influenced the generations that followed and is to be reckoned with even in our own day, was Augustine; who, also, was a native of North Africa but may be called the cosmopolite of the Western Church. He, too, was followed by a bishop, Gregory the Great, who popularized the teachings of his forerunner, and came to be known as the last of the bishops and the first of the popes, marking the turning point from the ancient Greco-Roman age to the medieval Romano-Teutonic age.

With the skill and clarity that one can achieve only by a life-time of study of the sources, the author presents, in fascinating literary form, what these men thought about God, Christ, Salvation, the Church, the Sacraments, and the Christian Life. The comparisons and contrasts of the thoughts of men who lived at different periods, spoke in different tongues, and faced different issues, are especially illuminating to the teacher and the student, e. g., the contrast between Augustine and Anselm, between Augustine and Irenaeus, between Augustine and Gregory of Nyssa in their interpretation of the Trinity, between Augustine's and Zwingli's views of God as the author of sin. The chapter on "From Arnobius to Jerome" brings to light thinkers of secondary rank and yet of no small influence in the development of the church of the West.

The second part of the book is given wholly to the thought of the Middle Ages, a term which the author accepts because it is in general use. At the same time he protests against the implication that it was a transitional age, and therefore is to be distinguished from other periods. "All ages are transitional. It has not made for sound understanding either of the past or the present that one age alone has been singled out for the honor or the obloquy of being known principally as a bridge between two

others" (p. 165). On this point one may find valid reasons to differ from the author.

A chapter is given to each of the following thinkers: John Scotus Eriugena, Anselm, Abelard, Bernard of Clairvaux and Francis of Assisi, Hugo of St. Victor and Peter Lombard, Thomas Aquinas, Duns Scotus and William of Ockham, Eckhart and the Mystics, Erasmus and the humanists. Not least valuable among the chapters of Book iv are the two on "The Sacraments" and "The Church and the Papacy."

In describing the characteristics of this long period of a thousand years the author calls the reader's attention to the fact that the so-called ancient Catholic Church "conditioned in important ways the Christian thinking of the Middle Ages. It meant for one thing that the continuity with the thinking of the past was maintained unbroken. The Middle Ages inherited the doctrinal system of an earlier day as formulated in the east and modified and supplemented by the Latin Fathers" (p. 167). Yet he recognizes that there were creative thinkers of the first order during this time, who enriched the Christian tradition and represented various types of thought—rationalism, supernaturalism, mysticism, humanism.

One who has taught church history for a generation cannot but feel that the publication of these volumes will mark an epoch in teaching Christian doctrine in our schools, colleges and seminaries—an epoch comparable in its significance to the publication of the monumental work of Professor Philip Schaff completed so satisfactorily by his son Professor David Schley Schaff, a generation ago. It will be a long time before this *History of Christian Thought* will be superseded. For years to come it will be used as a text book, for collateral reading assigned by the teacher to the students, and read with profit by the intelligent laymen of all the churches.

George W. Richards.

Theological Seminary of the Reformed Church
in the United States.

METHODISM IN AMERICAN HISTORY

By WILLIAM WARREN SWEET. New York: The Methodist Book Concern, 1933. 434 pages. \$3.00.

Professor Sweet's new volume will undoubtedly take its place as the authoritative history of American Methodism. It fills a place which no other volume fills at the present time. In fact, there has been no scholarly textbook since the work of Abel Stevens. There have been various volumes on Methodist history, but they have either been denominational chronicles or works of popularization which did not assume to represent independent investigation of source material.

Professor Sweet's volume admirably fills the need. It combines the extensive and unique knowledge of source material which has found expression in Professor Sweet's earlier monographs such as *Circuit Rider Days Along the Ohio*, and *The Methodist Church in the Civil War*. To this scholarly equipment and research there is added the gift for narrative and compression shown in Professor Sweet's volume of three years ago, *The Story of Religions in America*, in which he gave a scholarly yet

general panorama view of the history of the various religious movements in the United States.

Professor Sweet's present volume appears very appropriately just on the eve of the celebration of the sesqui-centennial of American Methodism to be observed in 1934. Emphasis on his reliance on the sources and a familiarity in the field should not be allowed to create the impression that what one has in this volume is just a factual chronicle of the history of a denomination. The very title of the book gives indication of a wider purpose than that. It is not the glorification of a denomination, nor yet is it a mere recital of happenings, of names, and dates and places; it is an endeavor, and a remarkably successful one, to estimate the Methodist movement as a factor in the life of the United States, the extent to which it has been moulded by conditions in life in the United States, and the extent to which in turn it has made contribution of its own to the forming of what might be called the national mind and the national life. Particularly interesting to the general reader are the chapters dealing with the dramatic story of the westward march, the thrust into the receding frontier; the chapter on Methodism in the Gilded Age, 1880-1900; also the post-war history covering fields in which very little has been done before. The history also includes the Methodist Episcopal Church South.

Any features which the reader might feel still to be desired are concerned with the inevitable limitations of space. Dr. Sweet has been so suggestive and illuminating in the places in which he has dealt with the conditioning of the church life by the forces and facts of geography and national history, that one wishes there might have been a much larger amount of interpretation. Then also one is continually wondering just what estimate the author puts on the various chapters of history which he relates. He has succeeded in keeping an impartial point of view, and yet one wonders whether it could not still have been strictly historical and yet had the interest which comes from an examination of the permanent values in the action of different forces. But to ask for that would mean to ask for a larger book. It is hard to see how a one volume history could better at once serve as an accurate presentation and also give first aid to the imagination in getting a landscape view of one hundred and fifty years of significant achievement in the religious life of the country.

Halford E. Luccock.

Yale Divinity School.

GESCHICHTE DER ALTER KIRCHE

Von HANS LIETZMANN. Band I. Die Anfange. Berlin and Leipzig: Walter de Gruyter & Co., 1932. vii, 323 pages. RM. 7.

Dr. Lietzmann has now given us the first volume of his history of the ancient church, which will be completed in five volumes. The author comes to his task with the special qualification that he is a master not only in the field of history but in that of New Testament study. Of all the works which deal with the subject this is the only one which will be able to lay claim to real completeness. Other historians are content to assume the church as an institution which was growing to full vigor about the end of the first century. Dr. Lietzmann examines its New Testament

beginnings and tries to discover in the work of Jesus the springs of the movement which was gradually to spread over the world. The first volume is concerned with these questions of origin, and carries the development to the time of Ignatius and the rise of Gnosticism. Within the limits of a single volume it is obviously impossible to discuss fully the life and teaching of Jesus, the history of the Apostolic Age, the theologies of Paul and John, the making of the New Testament literature. Dr. Lietzmann, in the effort to condense his material, is often obliged to speak too dogmatically, and there is scarcely a paragraph to which the reader will not put some question mark. But the treatment is extraordinarily fresh and independent, and never merely fanciful. While he gathers up the results of older enquiry and gives his own interpretations, the author makes skillful use of recent discoveries, many of them hardly known as yet except to small circles of specialists. A capital instance is in the closing chapter on Gnosis, perhaps the most illuminating in the book. The older knowledge is here blended with the newer, in such a way as to educe something like a clear picture from what has hitherto been little more than a huge blur. To those who are familiar only with the older type of church history Dr. Lietzmann's book will, in one respect, be a welcome surprise. While it is the product of exhaustive scholarship, it is also a work of literature. It is admirably proportioned, and is written throughout in a clear and effective style which makes the reading of it a pleasure. If the subsequent volumes fulfill the promise of the first it ought to hold its place for a long time as the standard history of the early church.

E. F. Scott.

Union Theological Seminary.

STUDIES IN THE BIRTH OF THE LORD

By ELWOOD WORCESTER. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1932.
300 pages. \$2.50.

A distinguished and scholarly clergyman, formerly the rector of Emmanuel Church in Boston, here surveys recent research regarding the birth stories in the first and third Gospels. The record he has published is frank and courageous. It was occasioned by a "Pastoral Letter" from the House of Bishops of Dr. Worcester's own communion in which the doctrine of the Virgin Birth was pronounced vindicated by the very best scholarship. This pious but flagrant misrepresentation of scholarship (as contrasted with apologetics) aroused the rector of Emmanuel Church to investigate the problem for himself. His summaries and conclusions are distinctly worthy of publication.

The survey includes a fresh analysis of the content and motivation of both the Matthean and Lucan birth stories and genealogies, a close study of the Jewish sources involved, the interrogation of pertinent passages from Philo, some comparative study in Zoroastrian and Buddhistic records, and searching comment on Talmudic and non-canonical Christian accounts of Jesus' birth. Contemporary Graeco-Roman tales of supernatural birth are slightly dismissed from consideration.

The modesty of the author's own conclusions is suggested by his chapter title: "A Tentative Solution." Regarding the Matthean recital Dr. Worcester suggests that it was an advanced expression of Jewish

Christian Haggada based on Septuagint mistranslations of alleged Messianic passages. His account of the Lucan birth narrative is more specific. It was devised by Apollos of Alexandria, strongly influenced by Philo's notion of exceptional birth in the case of "Children of promise."

Our knowledge of Apollos and of Alexandrian Christianity in the first century is quite too scanty to support the weight of this hypothesis. Furthermore the theory of Lucan authorship for the third gospel—also presupposed by Dr. Worcester—is so very precarious as further to weaken his conclusion. Harnack's early dating for the third gospel, which is also advocated, is now generally abandoned even by conservative scholars who still support the theory of Lucan authorship.

Had the author examined contemporary Graeco-Roman sources concerning supernatural birth as assiduously as he has studied Jewish records, his account of the whole matter would undoubtedly have been very different, and much more adequate. His *Studies* as they stand emphatically call attention to the need for a definitive investigation of the rise of the Virgin Birth tradition from the point of view of the demands of early Christian propaganda among Gentiles.

Harold R. Willoughby.

The University of Chicago.

THE MARCH OF FAITH: THE STORY OF RELIGION IN AMERICA SINCE 1865

BY WINFRED ERNEST GARRISON. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1932.
332 pages. \$2.50.

Since Dr. Garrison probably collaborated in the publishers' statement of the motif of his book, it may be taken as an authoritative résumé of what he sought to do: find "a common thread" running through the complicated religious pattern of American life for the last three-quarters of a century. This "common thread"—and it is anything but a thread—is the reaction of the church mind and method to the political, economic and social factors in action since the Civil War.

His principle of organization, therefore, has been to discover and set out the dominant aspects of American life and consider the responses of churches and their leaders to the always changing scene, with the necessary evaluation of the influence of all this upon religion and the influence of religion upon the complex factors of American society. The result is a closely textured and extremely informing general history in which the religious strands are generally interwoven with the course of events. In some chapters they—the religious strands—determine the pattern so to speak, in others they divide the interest of engaging narrative and in passages, considerable in their total content, the march of faith is crowded quite into the background by the march of events most engrossingly told.

Twenty chapters with a high factual content—there are between 1400 and 1500 items in the index—is a demanding load for 300 pages of text. Movement must be quick, distribution deft, organization in-

clusive, the facts significant and of high interest content, as little as possible left out and unity achieved. Dr. Garrison has managed all this admirably. His book is a mine of information and more than easy to read.

His method has its limitations. The forces native to religion itself whose dissolving, challenging or transforming action will, I venture to believe, be finally seen as the crucial aspect of the march of faith during the period studied are of necessity subordinated—though they are in the texture of the narrative. The quieter and actually creative contributions of religion are always hard to make vivid history of; they are also in the background. No recent account of American religion has done justice to the development of religious education—that chapter still remains to be written. Neither “theology” nor “worship” are in the index.

The chapter on the World War reflects, perhaps unconsciously, a spirit of *ex post facto* moral judgment which none of us who shared the passion of that period are in a position to pass. The Crapsey trial should certainly have been included in chapter six—one of the most telling chapters in the book. Dr. Garrison is very often the shrewd, and often enough the witty commentator. He is not as often as his distinguished ability would easily make possible, the interpreter.

But: he has written out of exhaustive and scholarly research with commendable detachment and has covered the entire field. His bibliography is invaluable, his achievement highly authoritative. His work should close a period of historical writing. What has now been done in the field of American church history—past and present—in the last decade or so leaves no room nor need for additional general writing in that field for a very long generation. And what the hypothetical church historian of the future, who will see it all in a perspective not now possible, will make of it in his retelling, belongs to prophecy and not reviewing.

Gaius Glenn Atkins.

Auburn Theological Seminary.

CHRISTIAN UNITY IN PRACTICE AND PROPHECY

By CHARLES MACFARLAND. New York: The Macmillan Co., 1933.
xvii, 396 pages. \$2.75.

Dr. Macfarland has gathered into this book the fruits of long experience in the promotion of coöperation and union, and employed in addition materials made available by scholars on the academic phases of the subject. About half of the book is historical, though much of the history dealt with is of very recent making. The author is very conscious of the confusing multiplicity of the unity-seeking organizations, and of the “general want of constructiveness” in the church unity movement as a whole. He avoids on principle the advocacy of any fixed plan of union, believing that all advance must be along developmental and experiential lines. A special familiarity with the history of the Federal Council is abundantly evident. While the author expects more from federal than from organic unity, he feels that the story of the Council indicates that federal unity is

likely to "become increasingly organic." The relation of the Evangelical Alliance to the Federal Council is represented as one of parenthood, and considerable space is given to the historically neglected subject of the Alliance. The treatment of the Lausanne Conference is of interest for the view that through futile discussion of points of doctrine the conference discovered that Christian unity cannot wait for a theological synthesis. Dr. Macfarland sees the history of the Protestant churches in America as marked by a gradual advance toward unity through stages of inter-denominational opposition, indifference, toleration and coöperation. The most pressing task of the present is, he thinks, "to unify the *disjecta membra* of federal unity itself." The numerous reasoned suggestions presented in the later sections of the book are not of special interest to historical workers and need not be reviewed here.

The permanent value of this book lies mainly in what it derives from the author's experience. Writing "for students rather than for scholars," Dr. Macfarland has made a useful contribution for which all his readers will be grateful. But if the prospective reader anticipates, as from the words "in Practice" in the title he might be led to do, that he will be taken to the scene of the local community and shown the actual operation of union in terms of human life, he will meet with disappointment. Instead he will find the book to be the product of a well-informed and well-disposed official mind long familiar with church attitudes as seen from the administrative angle.

John T. McNeill.

The University of Chicago.

FAUSTUS SOCINUS

By DAVID MUNROE CORY, TH. D. Boston: The Beacon Press, 1932.
155 pages. \$2.00.

Scholarly, interesting and relatively brief biographies in English of Luther, Calvin, Zwingli, Knox and other leaders of the Reformation are not hard to find; but here is the first work of such description on Faustus Socinus. Its career began as a Th. D. thesis supervised (and now prefaced) by Professor F. J. Foakes-Jackson of Union Theological Seminary. Dr. Cory is a Presbyterian minister of Brooklyn, N. Y. A more satisfactory piece of work could scarcely have been done.

For a long time, when Socinianism was regarded as a rather dubious form of "rational Christianity," church historians found the *Life of Faustus Socinus* by Joshua Toulmin (1777), or the account in Fock (*Der Socinianismus*, Kiel 1847) or in Wallace's *Anti-Trinitarian Biography* sufficient for their purposes. But of late years the general appraisal of Socinianism and its founders has radically changed. The increased attention (and appreciation) accorded Christian Humanism and the Erasmian Reformation have led us to see that of its principles of rational and ethical emphasis and method Socinianism, more than any of the other great Reform movements, was both heir and transmitter. Moreover, the several recent works on religious freedom (Ruffini, Bury, Luzzati, Van Loon, Martin) have been outspoken in their praise of the Sozzini and their followers as major factors in the promotion of this principle and the

right solution of this problem in post-Reformation Europe. Since Socinianism was a brilliant phase of the Polish Renaissance culture, the stimulus imparted to the study of the latter by the establishment of independent national status has operated to focus attention once more upon the heretics of Cracow and Racow, of Smiegel, Lublin and Wegrow. Finally, as Dr. Cory frequently remarks (e. g. p. 90), the quiet insistence of Socinus upon the theology of the Gospels as the core and norm of true Christianity, and upon abstention from war and the infliction of the death penalty, though aggravating both the heresy and the persecution of the heretics in the seventeenth century, commends both most favorably to the sympathy of modernist Protestant pacifists in the twentieth. Indeed we know of two more significant monographs on the Socinians shortly to be published by eminent scholars. One of these, at least, will supplement the present study from the yield of Polish sources and views.

This by Dr. Cory sets an admirable precedent. A better comingling of historical background and story, biographical portraiture and theological interpretation would be hard to imagine. The distinction between the theological teachings of Faustus himself and those of the Raco-vian Catechism and later Socinian theologians has been carefully drawn. We hope that Dr. Cory will sometime develop his intimation of the relation between Carnesecchi and the Sozzini.

Charles Lytle.

The Meadville Theological School, Chicago.

NEW TESTAMENT TIMES IN PALESTINE

By SHAILER MATHEWS. New and Revised Edition. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1933. xiv, 307 pages. \$2.00.

The popular and useful textbook by Dean Mathews, *A History of New Testament Times in Palestine*, published in 1899, is reissued in a rewritten form. Close inspection, however, hardly bears out the announcement that this is a "new and revised edition." It is rewritten in the interest of Dean Mathews' interpretative point of view, which is that the struggle of Jewish leaders against absorption in a polytheistic culture led to a unity of the nature of Judaism in its antecedents and its various aspects. Probably no one will be inclined to question the validity of this viewpoint. But nothing which has been added to the book indicates that the actual nature of late Judaism has been delineated. As a matter of fact, aside from recasting the chapter division, adding paragraphs to the text and references in the footnotes, and occasionally restating generalizations, the content is substantially the same as the reprints of the earlier editions. This may be clearly seen, for example, in the footnotes; aside from adding a few references to recent studies the notes still carry references to Renan, Graetz, Schurer, *et al.*, and citations of periodicals dated in the 1880's and '90's. Nor does it appear that the best use has been made of modern secondary literature. Dean Mathews seems to be hostile to the viewpoint of Moore with reference to the nature of late Judaism, while, on the other hand, he is too easily satisfied with referring to Herford and even Max Radin, who is certainly no authority on anything, least of all the history of Judaism. It might have been hoped, since the book de-

pends so basically upon the Maccabean books and Josephus, that attention would have been paid to modern critical studies of these sources, but there is nothing in the text to substantiate this hope. In fine, this is another illustration of the difficulty of rewriting a successful textbook. Unless the author is willing to go to the same amount of drudgery in research which produced the book in the first place, there is little value in a reissue. Readers will doubtless be instructed by the thesis which underlies the work in its present form, but they will not find in it a competent, up to date statement of scholarly work in the history of late Judaism.

Donald W. Riddle.

The University of Chicago.

THE CHURCH HISTORY DEPUTATION

REPORT OF THE CHURCH HISTORY DEPUTATION TO THE ORIENT, SEPTEMBER 1931 TO MARCH 1932. Printed for private circulation. London and New York: International Missionary Council, 1932. 82 pages.

This booklet is a formal report of a project with which the American Society of Church History has been officially associated and which may prove to have far-reaching significance in teaching and research. At the suggestion of Dr. John R. Mott, the American Society of Church History appointed a deputation consisting of Professors Shirley Jackson Case and W. D. Schermerhorn, who, in conjunction with the Rev. E. R. Morgan, Warden of the College of the Ascension at Selly Oak, Birmingham, visited the Orient during the academic year 1931-1932. The purpose of the deputation was to stimulate a greater interest in the study and teaching of church history in the seminaries and other training schools preparing the ministry for the younger churches of the Orient and to gather information which would enable schools in the West to be of greater service to students preparing for work on the church's new geographical frontiers. The deputation particularly sought answers to the questions of what is being done and what more can be done to collect and preserve sources of information for the history of the indigenous churches of the Orient, what place the study of church history now occupies, and what attention should be devoted to it in the training and equipment of leaders for these churches. In this booklet a preliminary report is made, probably to be followed a little later by a fuller volume. The pamphlet is a fairly detailed account of what was discovered. In a concluding section a useful summary of the findings and recommendations is given.

The general impression made by the report — and amply confirmed by other evidence — is that all too little attention is being given to church history by the seminaries and training schools in the Orient, and that such church history as is taught is so presented that few students see the connection between it and the problems which they are facing to-day. Moreover, in only relatively few places is provision being made for collecting and preserving the material which in years to come will be invaluable for the study of the rise of Christianity in these lands.

The deputation, however, has accomplished even more than a survey. It has stimulated a fresh interest and suggested new approaches to the subject which ought in the years ahead to prove very fruitful. It is to

be hoped that seminaries, not only in the Orient but in this country, will reconsider the form in which they are teaching church history and the content of their courses in the light of what is happening in the Orient and of the needs of students who are preparing for service in Japan, China, India, Africa, and Latin America.

K. S. Latourette.

Yale Divinity School.

THE OTHER SPANISH CHRIST

By JOHN A. MACKAY. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1933.
xv, 288 pages, \$2.00.

Anyone who seeks to understand the present day religious situation in South America will find himself at once faced with the necessity of making a careful examination of the Iberian background out of which came Hispanic-American beginnings. He must know that the Spanish conquest of America was in a very real sense, as Mr. Mackay terms it, "the last of the Crusades", and that the type of Catholicism which there evolved was peculiar to South America. The strange mixture of pious word and profession with greed and cruelty meets one at every turn as he traces the adventures of any one of many *conquistadores*. Thus the friar Luque, the partner of Pizarro and Almagro in the conquest of Peru and the financier of the enterprise celebrated mass, in which the three partners partook of the same Host as a pledge that the spoils which would come from the plundering of Inca wealth should be equally divided. Officially, at least, the chief motive which brought the Spanish conqueror to America was religious; but it was a religion which seemed to find complete satisfaction in "magic formulas and ritual practice."

This peculiar type of Christianity introduced into the Spanish colonies came in time to be South-americanized. This process Dr. Mackay describes, following largely the interpretation suggested by the distinguished Spanish scholar and essayist, Don Miguel de Unamuno, in his *Mi Religión y Otros Ensayos*. The Christ evolved in South America is a dead Christ with no power to help in the affairs of life, and therefore the pious South American finds his daily consolation in the adoration of the Virgin and the saints. The consequence is that those who have been brought up under these influences have either been lulled into the "Coalman's faith" or have reacted against all religion. In the words of Dr. Ricardo Rojas (*El Christo Invisible*), formerly president of the University of Buenos Aires, South American Catholicism lacks two constitutive features of the Christian religion, an inward spiritual experience and an outward ethical expression (pp. 121-122).

In the last part of his brilliant interpretation of South American Christianity, Dr. Mackay discusses the forces which are bringing about the resurrection of the *Other Spanish Christ*. Here he gives much attention to a group of present-day Spanish and South American writers, chief among whom is Don Miguel de Unamuno, characterized as "the strongest moralist of our day", besides whose "well-aimed roar" Wells and Shaw have thin voices. Others having a part in the resurrection of

the *Other Spanish Christ* are Ricardo Rojas, Julio Navarro Monzo, and Gabriela Mistral, the latter a liberal Catholic poetess of Chile, the two former more or less religious rebels. The last two chapters are an attempt to appraise the part Protestantism is playing in the resurrection process.

Those who seek an understanding of present-day Christianity in Hispanic America cannot overlook this painstaking and thoughtful discussion.

William W. Sweet.

The University of Chicago.

THE HUTTERIAN BRETHREN

By JOHN HORSCH. Goshen, Indiana: Mennonite Historical Society, 1931.
168 pages. \$2.00.

The Hutterites, or Hutterian Brethren as the author sometimes calls them, are a small group of Moravian Anabaptists, who through relentless persecution have been driven for the past four centuries from one country to another across southeastern Europe, but during all that time have kept their corporate existence as well as their faith, their social customs and economic institutions in their original Moravian purity. Forced out of Moravia in the early seventeenth century, they found temporary homes in Hungary, Transylvania, and Roumania, from whence in the late eighteenth century they left for Russia where they were promised both religious toleration and military exemption. Here they remained for another hundred years, but upon the loss of their special military privileges they migrated en masse, several hundred of them, to the Dakota prairies. Even this was not to be their permanent abiding place. The recent World War, with its intolerance of non-resistants, drove the Hutterites across the border, several thousand of them, into the western provinces of Canada where nearly all of them are to be found to-day.

The Hutterites differ from other Anabaptist groups in their communism. They still live in small groups called *Bruderhofs*, comprising from twenty to thirty families each. They are perhaps the oldest existing communistic colonies in the world, and owe their continued existence no doubt to the fact that they have based their experiment upon a religious sanction, and especially their doctrine of non-resistance and sense of other-worldliness, rather than upon an economic philosophy.

The book is a scholarly production, well documented, but the material is not well organized nor the story well told for the average reader with only the average knowledge of church history. The sterling qualities of Christian character of the Hutterites are well brought out, but a little more attention to the weaknesses of the experiment might perhaps give a more exact picture of this most interesting adventure in Christian communism.

C. Henry Smith.

Bluffton College,
Bluffton, Ohio.

**PROTESTANTISMENS HISTORIE I AMERIKAS
FÖRENTA STATER**

By GUNNAR WESTIN. Stockholm: Svenska Kyrkans Diakonistyrelses Bokförlag, 1931. 512 pages. Kr. 8, 50 and 10, 50.

This is the first time a history of American Protestantism has been written in Swedish. The author is a young man, professor at the Baptist Seminary in Stockholm, who a few years ago took his Ph.D. degree at Upsala University, and who shortly afterwards was called to the church history chair at that university.

Three years ago Dr. Westin spent a year in this country, and the results of his studies at that time are found in the present book. The author, who did most of his research work in the Congressional Library, does not claim his book to be based on original sources but on secondary works, something the reader will soon discover. While it then does not give us any new historical facts, the book is a splendid interpretation of the accepted facts, and may be favorably compared with anything which has been written previously on this subject in any language. The book reveals a broad reading. The bibliography, which contains only works in English which the author has consulted, consists of twenty-four pages. The preface, which deals with a critical analysis of works on American secular, and church history, reveals an insight one would not expect in a young foreigner.

The construction of the book is logical. In the colonial period Dr. Westin deals with each colony, and after the revival period he describes the place of each denomination in the development of American Christianity. The fact that he gives considerable space to the history of W. E. Channing shows that he has a clear conception of the importance of the Unitarian movement for the development of American Protestantism.

It is to be hoped that this high class work may soon be translated into English. It is a real contribution to the history of American Protestantism.

P. Stiansen.

Northern Baptist Theological Seminary, Chicago.

THE JEWISH BACKGROUND OF CHRISTIANITY

By N. LEVISON. Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1932. xvi, 205 pages.
5 s.

The value which this book possesses doubtless inheres in the fact that its author is a Christian Jew. A work on the Jewish background of Christianity which can view the processes of development from the Christian position, yet with the *rapport* with Judaism which only a Jewish scholar may have, offers promise. Unfortunately, any such promise in the present case is unfulfilled. The author's knowledge of late Judaism is derived from Christian scholars, and what he has generalized is a *melange* from varying points of view. There is no evidence of scientific use of sources, nor is there the necessary balance of information from rabbinical and

extra-Talmudic sources. Furthermore, a somewhat curious theological viewpoint is basic throughout the work, so that few questions are discussed without being conditioned by theological prepossession. Some interesting Jewish stories are told to illustrate biblical texts, and the author's Jewishness enables him to make certain conjectures which, although they add somewhat to the interest of the volume, would not otherwise be seriously considered. It cannot be said that this work deserves a place beside the studies of Herford, Abrahams, and Moore.

Donald W. Riddle.

The University of Chicago.

THE HISTORY OF THE MONASTERIES OF NITRIA AND SCETIS

By HUGH G. EVELYN WHITE. Edited by Walter Hauser. New York:
The Metropolitan Museum of Art, 1932. xliv, 495 pages. \$15.00
in paper; \$17.50 in boards.

This splendidly printed work forms the second part of *The Monasteries of the Wâdi 'n Natrûn*, the first part of which, published earlier, dealt with *The Architecture and Archaeology* of these early Egyptian monastic establishments. The volume under review, which was edited by Mr. Walter Hauser because of the death of the author before the manuscript was fully completed, deals in an exhaustive fashion with the origins of Egyptian monasticism, the foundation of the two earliest monasteries—Nitria and Scetis—and their subsequent history to the modern times. Since one or the other of these establishments was most intimately connected with the history of the Coptic church throughout, the work is a most valuable contribution to our knowledge of the history of Christianity in Egypt. In fact, it may be said to be the first thoroughly scholarly treatment of the subject in English.

The author is the first to point out, on the basis of an exhaustive accumulation of evidence, that Nitria and Scetis, often confused by writers as if they were the same monastery, were in reality two distinct establishments. Quite rightfully, he defines the causes which led the Coptic church into the Monophysite schism as the rivalry of the See of Alexandria and the Patriarchate of Constantinople for primacy in the East, and the racial instinct of the Egyptian people—rather than a nationalist sentiment—which resented the domination of the Byzantines. These, rather than any differences in abstract formulation of the Christological doctrine, were the real causes of the schism.

A few slips caused possibly by oversight may be pointed out. On p. 129, John Chrysostom is referred to as "Bishop of Antioch", a position he never held. Footnote 1 on p. 165 mistakenly identifies a certain "heresy" referred to in the text as "the Chalcedonian"; but since the action took place prior to 451, this can not properly be thus designated. Moreover, the use of the adjective "Jacobite" as applied to the Coptic church tends to confuse rather than clarify the concepts involved. It is, of course, true that both Syriac and Coptic churches were Monophysite

in Christology, but the term "Jacobite", if used at all, should properly be restricted to the former.

The work as a whole will prove of such invaluable aid in the study of Coptic church history that it is unreservedly and enthusiastically recommended.

Matthew Spinka.

The Chicago Theological Seminary.

NEGOTIATIONS ABOUT CHURCH UNITY, 1628-1634

By GUNNAR WESTIN. Uppsala: A.-B. Lundequistka Bokhandeln, 1932.
318 pages. 10 kr.

The tercentenary of the death of Gustavus Adolphus has prompted an interest in the motives and purpose of the Swedish action in Germany during the Thirty Years' War. Church affairs in general and the reconciliation of Lutherans and Calvinists in particular have an important bearing on events of the period. This monograph, appropriately dedicated to the memory of the late Archbishop Söderblom, presents a detailed account of negotiations in the interest of peace and unity among Protestants during the period of the Swedish intervention.

John Dury was the leader in these negotiations and this volume is essentially an account of his early reunion activities. He began with an attempt to persuade leaders of church and state in Sweden to assume the leadership of a movement designed to unite the Lutheran and Calvinistic churches. His negotiations with Gustavus Adolphus, Oxenstierna and the Swedish clergy aroused sanguine hopes for success, but powerful factions in Sweden and Germany opposed his plans. The death of Gustavus Adolphus deprived Dury of the one prospective patron who was in position to bring his program to successful realization. In his effort to secure a new champion for his reunion proposals, he conducted negotiations with Frederick V of the Palatinate, Oxenstierna, Charles I, Laud, and the leaders of the Protestant churches in the various German principalities.

In each case Dury met with disappointment, but the record of his negotiations affords unusual insight into the conditions prevailing in the churches and gives the clearest indices of the views of his contemporaries regarding the advisability and possibility of establishing peace and unity among Protestants. More than one-third of the volume is devoted to the publication of the text of Dury's letters and papers. This material, gathered from widely scattered sources, will prove useful for students of church life in the seventeenth century. Westin's monograph will serve as an indispensable aid for students who wish to achieve a thorough mastery of the history of Christian irenics during the period of the Thirty Years' War.

J. Minton Batten.

Scarritt College, Nashville, Tenn.